

**THE
THREE GREAT
DEBATES
OF
ROBERT
ROBERTS**



THE THREE GREAT DEBATES OF ROBERT ROBERTS

- **Stern — WAS JESUS OF NAZARETH
THE MESSIAH?**
- **Bradlaugh — IS THE BIBLE DIVINE?**
- **Hine — ARE ENGLISHMEN
ISRAELITES?**

Christadelphian Scripture Study Service

Typeset and Printed by
Stallard & Potter
2 Jervois St, Torrensville
South Australia

Published by
The Christadelphian Scripture Study Service
17 Braemar Road, Torrens Park
South Australia
April, 1987

FOREWORD

One of the distinctive qualities of Brother Robert Roberts was his ready recall of information on a wide range of topics both scriptural and historical. Readers of his works must also have been impressed with the keenness of his logic, the reasonableness of a God-fearing mind nurtured from a young age in the Scriptures of truth.

These qualities made him very suitable to the editorship of "The Christadelphian" magazine for those 34 years until his death in 1898 and the present availability of those volumes must be impressing many of us with Brother Roberts' wise and versatile mind.

The same qualities made him a most capable debater and in this book the three most famous of his debates are brought together and made available for the present generation of Christadelphians. We hope they may be an inspiration to all their readers and especially so to those of keen and younger mind who will see in these valiant defences for the Truth the fruit of many hours of quiet reflective study of the Word of God and all related subjects. Here is the grown man who as a young man of 13 years prepared a chart of Bible readings "first for information and then for daily sustenance in the things of the Spirit".

May the courage and wisdom of these debates continue to enthuse us in service to the God of truth.

On behalf of the Committee.

September 1986

B.N. Luke.
Secretary.

PREFACE

The following Discussion is published jointly by the disputants, who have revised their speeches as furnished from a shorthand writer's notes.

It originated as follows: On Monday, September 18th, 1871, Mr. Segfried Gratz, a Jew, having embraced the Christadelphian faith, lectured in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, "on the promises of God, considered from a new and purely Israelitish point of view." The Jews of Birmingham, who were specially invited, attended in moderate numbers, and at the close of the lecture, one of their number, Mr. Joel Monaet, of Birmingham, challenged Mr. Gratz to public controversy. The challenge was accepted, and a single night's debate (Tuesday, October 3rd) before a crowded house, was the result. At this debate, Mr. Roberts, with the consent of both parties, occupied the chair; and, at the close of the meeting, he expressed his regret that his position precluded him from speaking on the subject. This drew from Mr. Stern, who was present, a proposal for discussion, which resulted in the three nights' discussion herein reported.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

WAS JESUS OF NAZARETH THE MESSIAH?

THREE NIGHTS' DISCUSSION

The discussion was held in the Temperance Hall, Temple Street, Birmingham, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, October 17th, 18th and 19th, 1871, between Mr. Robert Roberts and Mr. Louis Stern, both of Birmingham. There was a large and respectable audience each night. The chair was occupied, the three nights, by the Rev. B. Wright, Unitarian minister.

THE CHAIRMAN, in opening the meeting the first night, said, In order that no person might come to a wrong conclusion respecting his presence in the chair: that he had no high opinion of the value of public discussions to those in search of truth. His impression was that truth was best served by writing, as writing did not so much lead to rouse those feelings which were often seen in connection with discussions of that character. After asking a fair hearing for each side, he called upon Mr. Roberts to open the discussion.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and gentlemen, my position to-night indicates that I do not altogether share the sentiments of the Chairman as to the utility of discussion. I agree with him that results of critical value are not to be arrived at in the course of controversy for any number of nights, but I think the stimulus given to the minds of listeners in the direction of the question agitated, tends much to subsequent interest and attention to the subject, and, therefore, indirectly, is ultimately of great value. Therefore I have willingly accepted the challenge given to me by Mr. Stern, believing that the great truth embodied in the proposition of to-night will obtain more attention when canvassed by controversy, than even if expounded in a lecture. However, letting that pass, I address myself to the duty that devolves upon me, which is to maintain that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. That affirmation embodies an issue that is exceedingly simple and convenient for discussion. We both agree, I presume, as to the two principal ideas that go to make up the proposition; we both agree as to what is meant by "Jesus of Nazareth", historically at all events; that he was an actual personage who appeared among the Jews 1,800 years ago. From Mr. Stern's character as an orthodox Jew, I am justified in presuming that we are also agreed as to the idea represented by the term "Messiah;" a Jewish expectation of now almost untold

centuries, that a certain great personage would arise among them who would be their ruler, their king, their head, their leader, who would re-establish their ancient commonwealth, and give them universal dominion in the erecting of a universal empire upon the basis of the Jewish nationality restored. Agreeing on these abstract points, the issue is simply this: was the one, the other? was Jesus of Nazareth that personage? Mr. Stern says No, I say Yes; and I will proceed to give substantial reasons for that answer.

My first reason is, that he appeared at the time when according to the prophets of the Jewish nation the Messiah of Israel ought to have appeared. I refer you to a prophecy of Daniel (9:24-25), which I will read:—

“Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, UNTO THE MESSIAH THE PRINCE, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.”

I assume it as a point conceded on all hands, and that, therefore, needs not to be discussed in connection with this controversy, that these seventy weeks are the symbolic equivalent of 490 years, upon the principle that in prophetic-symbolic usage, a day stands for a year, of which you will find a distinct and unquestionable illustration in the fourth chapter of Ezekiel, to which I will not now refer you more particularly. Seventy weeks multiplied by 7 (the number of days in a week) give a total of 490; and, therefore, presuming that Mr. Stern, in common with the Jews in general (and he will be at issue with his own brethren if it is otherwise, and the professing Christian community also), accepts the seventy weeks as symbolic of a period of 490 years; we have only to find out the commencement of the period, to ascertain the time when the Messiah ought to have appeared. The question is, what is the starting point of the period? The answer is as plain as could be desired: *“From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem:”* to understand which, we have to remember that at the time these words were addressed to Daniel, the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, where Daniel himself was at the time he received the vision. Jerusalem was lying in waste and desolation. The time had arrived for the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jeremiah (which I presume Mr. Stern will not question), that at the close of seventy years, Israel should be restored to their land. In view of these facts, the definition is an intelligible definition. From the issue of the edict that was to effect the re-building of the ruined city of Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, there should elapse a total period of 490 years, divided into three minor parts of 7, 62, and 1, with references to leading historical events that were to mark the interval. It comes to be a matter of simple historic enquiry as to when the edict was issued, and we find our answer within the two boards of the Bible. We find the issue of

the edict recorded in Nehemiah 2. There we are told that Nehemiah, who was cupbearer to Artaxerxes, the Persian king, was sad in the royal presence, and to the question put to him why he was sad, he answered thus (third verse):—

“Let the king live for ever: why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers’ sepulchres, *lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?* Then the king said unto me, For what dost thou make request? So I prayed to the God of heaven. And I said unto the king, if it please the king, and if thy servant have found favour in thy sight, that thou wouldest *send me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers’ sepulchres, THAT I MAY BUILD IT.*”

Thereupon the king gave orders for Nehemiah’s wish to be granted. He placed a military escort at his disposal, as appears from verse 9, and issued an official direction to the men in authority in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, to assist Nehemiah in the execution of the work. I am not unaware that previous to this, Ezra had co-operated with the Jews under an edict of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the Temple, but the command to restore and rebuild *Jerusalem* itself, transpired in the days of Nehemiah, who received and executed that order. The question is, what was the date of that order? Chronologists are agreed that the date was before Christ 456 and a fraction. How old was Christ when he died? Thirty-three and a fraction. Add thirty-three and a fraction to 456 and a fraction, and what is the result? 490 years — the very period defined in Daniel.

I, therefore, put forward, as the first reason for maintaining that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, the fact that he appeared at the precise period required by the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. The Jews themselves expected the appearance of their Messiah at that time. For this, we have the testimony of Josephus, who says that the Jews believed that that was the time when one of the Jewish nation should rise up to carry out the purpose declared in the prophets. His words, which will be found in his 7th book, 31st chapter, are as follow:—

“*That which chiefly excited them (the Jews) to war, was an ambiguous prophecy, THAT AT THAT TIME, someone within their country should arise that should obtain the empire of the whole world. This they had received, that it was spoken by one of their nation.*”

Here we have testimony of an historian whom I presume Mr. Stern will not call in question, that the Jewish nation were in expectation of the Messiah’s appearance, because of a prophecy which fixed upon THAT TIME as the period of his appearing. His testimony is confirmed by what we read in the New Testament, that at that time “all men were musing in their hearts whether John the Baptist were the Messiah or not.” How do the Jews account for this national expectancy 1,800 years ago, on their theory that the Messiah did not appear? There are many strange and conflicting explanations on their part. They do not agree amongst themselves. Their explanations, ancient and modern, illustrate the straits to which their rejection of Jesus reduces them.

Buxtorf says *“That the greater part of the modern Rabbins believe that the Messiah has been come a good while, but keeps himself concealed because of the sins of the Jews.”*

Jarchi affirms that *“The Hebrews believed the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of Jerusalem.”*

Talmudists — *that he is in Rome.*

“A great number believe he is not yet come, but strangely divided as to the time and circumstance of his appearing.”

So you see Mr. Stern’s own nation are divided in the most extraordinary manner in their methods of accounting for the non-appearance of the Messiah, in harmony with the prophet Daniel, whose prophecy requires that he ought to have appeared 1,800 years ago. The Jewish writers referred to in the extracts I have read, recognise the fact that the time fixed in the prophets, arrived ages ago; they deny that Jesus, who appeared exactly at that time, is he; they cannot point to anyone else as answering to the requirements of the prophecy. Hence the dilemma which they make such extraordinary efforts to get out of.

But, according to the proposition I have to maintain, there is no difficulty. The Messiah did appear, and Jesus of Nazareth was he, which proposition I proceed to elaborate a little more in detail.

I contend in the next place that Jesus of Nazareth answers to all the signs by which it is possible for the Jews to identify their Messiah. I should like Mr. Stern to let us know upon what principle the Jews are to tell their Messiah when he appears. I presume it would be upon the principle of his correspondence to the things declared in the prophets. If that is not the principle, there is no principle. But that *is* the principle undoubtedly, and therefore it gives me a basis for this argument, that in every material and immaterial particular, Jesus of Nazareth answered to the features and peculiarities that were to characterise the Messiah to be sent to Israel, and that, therefore, he was he.

The first of these is, that the Messiah was to be the Son of David. Jesus was the Son of David. This is capable of inanswerable demonstration, but I will not at this stage say all that can be said on this point. I produce the genealogies of Matthew and Luke as *prima facie* evidence, leaving Mr. Stern to deal with them. When he attempts to disprove them, I will follow and answer his arguments, and embrace the opportunity of unfolding a few things on the subject that may not be present to his mind. The genealogies upon their own face are evidence of Christ’s descent from David. I will so far anticipate objection to them, as to suppose the remark that Matthew’s genealogy is not Luke’s genealogy. That is a fact. What is the explanation of the fact? Jesus had a mother, and a legal but not a natural human father. If he was to be the seed of David, it was necessary he should be shown to be such by both lines. One therefore is the line of Mary, and the other that of Joseph. I must briefly indicate the principle upon which the conclusion is arrived

at, that one is the genealogical descent of Mary and the other of Joseph. In the first place, they are *different lines*. This will be admitted by all. The lines agree from Abraham down to the family of David (Matthew's not going farther back than Abraham), the identity can only be shown from that point. At David, the lines diverge; you find that one line descends through Nathan, the son of David, and the other line descends through Solomon. With the exception of one point of apparent casual contact, the two lines keep distinct until the days of Jesus. Therefore it cannot be denied they are two distinct lines. The next question is, Were they both received among the early Christians? They undoubtedly were, for although doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of the genealogy of Matthew, it is because it is omitted from one or two early manuscripts. The bulk of evidence is in its favour, for where there are one or two manuscripts that lack Matthew's genealogy, there are many in which it appears, upon which the argument may be briefly stated thus: It is far more likely that the genealogy was omitted from one or two manuscripts for sinister reasons, than added to a great number in the private possession of those who had means of ascertaining the genuineness of the documents. In fact, the latter is an impossible supposition, for the imposture would have been detected in a moment. This matter may be considered to be finally settled by Tischendorf's discovery, in the convent of Sinai, of the most ancient manuscript yet known. This manuscript contains Matthew's genealogy. It is indisputable that the two genealogies were accepted by the first Christians. If so, how can we imagine that they were both the actual genealogy of Joseph? Would they have received and recognised two contradictory accounts of so important a matter? Inconceivable! They received both, because both were separately true; the one setting forth Mary's descent, and the other Joseph's. If it be asked why Mary's name is not given, my answer is the answer that Mr. Monaet gave to Mr. Gratz the other night, for a different purpose. He said it was a rule among the Jews not to insert the names of females in the genealogies, which is probably the reason why Mary's name does not appear. Where a female is nevertheless an essential link, she appears by her husband as Mary does in the genealogy of Luke. There is no violation of propriety in this, for Joseph, as the husband of Mary, was "a son-in-law of Heli", Mary's father. A difference is observable between the two genealogies in this respect: that is, as to the mode in which they are drawn out. In Matthew, it is said, "Abraham *begat* Isaac, Isaac *begat* Jacob," and so on; but in Luke it does not employ the term "*begat*", a form of speech which would have been incompatible with putative sonship, legal or imputed sonship. It begins as follows: "Jesus began to be about thirty years of age, being, *as was supposed*, the son of Joseph, which was (the son) of Heli." "Son of" is not in the original. I admit that idiomatically it is implied, and therefore properly inserted in the English translation. Nevertheless, it is a form of speech which does not affirm that Joseph was the natural son of Heli. It is a form of putting it that admits of Joseph being called the son of Heli, although he was the son of Jacob, being son-in-law to Heli, through marriage with his daughter Mary. Jewish rules did not admit of

Mary appearing except in this way. I will leave that subject at present, reserving further arguments until Mr. Stern shall have stated his objections to the genealogies. But I proceed to remark that the proof of Jesus being the son of David is by no means confined to this genealogy. I rely greatly upon this fact, that the question of whether Jesus was the son of David was never raised until modern times; that in the first century, when there was access to the public registers — when, if Christ was not the son of David, it could have been proved while the temple yet stood and whilst Mary's genealogy and Joseph's were in existence — the point was never raised at all. Do you think Christ's enemies, who crucified him, would not have been glad to seize upon so fatal an objection to his claims, if they could have done so? In his own day, it was the general repute that he was the son of David, both among the common people and amongst those who had an opportunity of being critically certain. First, as to the common belief, I quote the following passages:—

Matt. 9:27: "And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying and saying, *Thou son of David*, have mercy on us."

Matt. 12:23: "All the people were amazed and said, Is not this *the son of David*?"

Matt. 15:22: "And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy upon me, O Lord, *thou son of David*."

Matt. 20:30: "And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou son of David*."

Matt. 21:9-11: "And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to *the son of David*: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth, of Galilee."

And at the fifteenth verse it says, "When the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to *the son of David*, they were sore displeased." This proves two things, first that the popular impression was that he was the son of David, and second, that the popular impression was brought under the cognition of the scribes and pharisees; and they never challenged it, although they had the power of disproving it, if Jesus were not the son of David. The objection is only now raised in these remote times, when it is possible to raise it without incurring that authoritative contradiction, which could have been given in the day when the public documentary evidence existed in the temple.

But I give you better authority, than popular impression. I give you the authority of a priest who waited on his office in the temple. I do not suppose Mr. Stein will dispute that Zachariah was of "the course of Abia." In that position of

access to the public archives then, we find him saying “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us *in the house of His servant David*, as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets which have been since the world began.” Remember these are the words of a priest in the temple, having a distinct and intimate relation to the records of genealogy, which either confirmed or destroyed the impression concerning the origin or extraction of Jesus. And I say that if a man in that position confirms the popular impression that Jesus belongs to the house of David, it would require far stronger argument than any person living in the nineteenth century can produce to shake belief in the well-foundedness of that impression (“Time” called).

MR. STERN: Mr. Chairman and friends. Before I commence to answer Mr. Roberts, I beg you will listen to a few remarks that I have to make with regard to my position here to-night. In the first place, I am not here to-night as representative of any body of Jews in Birmingham or in any other place. I have undertaken the subject entirely on my own responsibility, and if I am defeated in this discussion, it must not go forth that Judaism has been defeated by Christianity. It will then only be the defeat of one man, who holds that Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah, against another man who held that he was. I may also say that this discussion is not approved by the Jews in Birmingham, especially by the English portion of them, for reasons best known to themselves. One of the principal reasons is they are afraid this discussion may cause ill-feeling between Jews and Christians. I am not of that opinion myself: I have entirely a different opinion of an English audience. But suppose it was to cause ill-feeling (I am only taking it as a supposition, for I am sure it will not)—supposing it was, what then? I would far rather cause ill-feeling and have the truth on my side, than live in a state of bliss all my life with falsehood and error. Some of the Jews of Birmingham have gone so far as to assert that I am in league with the Missionary Society, that I have got this discussion up for the purpose of exposing Judaism. I am quite serious on this subject. These statements have really been made. I publicly contradict these statements. I am not in any way connected with any missionary society; and whoever has said so has told a falsehood. And I hope that my opponent will say that I am not in any way in league with him, for any such vile purpose. If I had anything to say against Judaism, I should certainly come forward like a man, and give my opponents a chance of replying to me. Now, I am announced on the placard as an orthodox Jew; and so I am, but I am not so orthodox as to come here and say that, simply because I am a Jew, all the truth lies on my side and all the error on the side of these who are opposed to Judaism. I believe that among the hundreds of millions of people who inhabit this globe, there will be found some at least, as noble and as courageous. Some of the greatest intellects have been found outside Judaism, and it would be the height of impertinence on my part, to come here and say that, being a Jew, I hold the whole truth,

and that no one else has a right to express any different opinion to mine. I have come here to-night to receive information as well as discuss the question before us.

With these few remarks I wish now to endeavour to answer Mr. Roberts. You need not be surprised if this discussion should lead me to embrace Christianity, but I must say that if it is his object, he must bring forward sounder arguments than he has used in his first speech. You have given Mr. Roberts earnest attention in all that he has said. I am sure he has said a good many and some very startling things. He says (if I understand him right), he believes in Judaism, and I believe he even says that he is a Jew. If it will give him any pleasure, I hope he will live long enough to enjoy it. I won't begrudge it him. But there is certainly this difference between us: Mr. Roberts is here as a Jew with Jesus as his saviour: I stand here as a Jew without Jesus as my saviour. As being "in Jesus" implies a belief in Christ, I hope he will pardon me if I sometimes class him among the ordinary Christians. He maintains that Jesus appeared exactly according to Daniel, consequently he must be the Messiah. If he did appear accordingly to Daniel he *must be* the Messiah, but let us examine what Daniel says:—

“Whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy.”

You have heard what I have read. This is the same quotation Mr. Roberts read, but it doesn't exactly agree with me the same as with him. Oh! says Mr. Roberts, you mustn't take the seventy weeks as seventy weeks; instead of representing weeks of days, you must take them to represent weeks of years: seventy times seven years. This is a most startling assertion, and I am perfectly satisfied, if this is the case, that it will really settle the question, and I am sure that if it is so, it is a great pity that we hadn't a Mr. Roberts long before now. Now sir, I hold that words have no meaning except as conveying thoughts of one individual to another; that is to say, if I have a thought which I wish to convey to any other person, I either learn their language or get them to learn mine. The tongue becomes the mould of the thought, and after the words are expressed, the party who is addressed does not alone hear the words, but he can almost see them as well: they are shaped before him. If seventy weeks should here mean weeks of years, see what a position we should be placed in. In the first place, how should we understand when anyone was conversing with us? This is a revelation from God to man. God, having a thought, wished man to know it, and through Daniel sends a

messenger who is to say something to the people, so that no doubt they should understand him; but Mr. Roberts says it doesn't mean what was really said. Why, I should not be here at all to-night if I could attribute such puerilities, cruelties, to the supreme power. The word God to me represents all that is good, and all that is good can include nothing bad; and it would be a very bad action, I hold, for a supreme being to speak to any of His people in a language they could not understand. But Mr. Roberts refers me to the New Testament to prove his statements. Well, I have told him before; I have announced it; and you have perceived by the placards that I am a Jew. Mr. Roberts knows very well that the New Testament is looked upon by the Jews as an immoral book. We are allowed to read any book almost, but it is positively looked upon as a sin to have the New Testament in our possession. We are even allowed to read the *Mysteries of the Court in London*, but not the New Testament. Still he refers me to it. I may as well tell him that as a Jew I look upon the New Testament as a compilation of falsehood and forgeries; and I will not alone *say* this, but I will bring you one of your greatest authorities in the church to *prove* my statement, —Dr. Mosheim. But I shall not enter into this now, for I may not have time to finish the subject. But I will say this, to me, as a Jew, I do not understand how a man can be born without a father. My opponent may try to explain it and cloak it over as much as he likes; he can use his eloquence as much as it is possible. Although I am willing to accept any reasonable explanation; but when I say that, it must be reasonable to me, mind, not to my opponent. But I hold this to be quite unreasonable. I should like to go into the matter, but I do not feel equal to the task before a mixed audience like the one we have here to-night. Privately I have no objection to discuss the matter with Mr. Roberts, but I do not consider it a fit subject for this audience. I think words would have to be used that would not be very soothing; at least to the gentler sex who are present. I am sure I have too much respect for the ladies to bring the slightest blush of shame upon their countenances. But what does he tell me about Jesus? He refers me to Saint Matthew, and from him I am to gather the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph. As I understand it, the book of Matthew begins: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Now is this the book of the generation of Jesus Christ? If Mr. Roberts earnestly refers me to this I hope he will abide by it; and before I discuss it, I wish him to tell me before this audience that he will abide by this genealogy. It is no use telling me that there is another one, if that contradicts this. When we are talking about this book, we are not talking about the ordinary subjects of the day. We are not talking about penny-a-liners, about books written in 1871; we are talking about what is believed to be an inspired book, which is supposed to have been written by the apostles, who, some of them at least, were along with Jesus when he was alive. Inspiration means this: that whether a person be present or not, he can describe everything minutely and accurately, so that there can be no mistake whatever about it. Take Moses for instance, he could write down everything that had occurred for hundreds and thousands of years before his time. But what are we to

say of men who are supposed to be inspired by the same power, and yet so contradict each other? But before I undertake to discuss the subject, I wish Mr. Roberts to say distinctly whether he will abide by the genealogy of Matthew? (Mr. Roberts: Yes.) And I wish to ask by whom, to whom, when, and in what language were St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John written? Where are your originals? Produce them. Where are your manuscripts? Produce them. If they are not to be found, please tell me what has become of them, and let us have some idea whether there is any hope of ever obtaining them again. I am afraid my friend will not be able to produce these originals, for I stand here and publicly declare the originals never were in existence. There never were any. No one dares come here and declare in 1871 that there ever were originals. There is no authority. No records can be gone to. We cannot go farther back than the second century. How can we rely upon them? I think the only reliance would be that whatever parties wrote them, they were never inspired by God to do so. For on such an important and serious subject as this, at least they should be all alike, at least they should not all contradict each other in the most important points. But, what do we find? Mr. Roberts can hardly quote two passages in the book that will agree with each other; and I am quite certain the Old Testament contradicts the New, although he jumps from one to the other and says they agree. I hope Mr. Roberts will answer the questions I have put to him, before he proceeds with any other matter.

MR. ROBERTS: I should think it unnecessary for me to make any pledge on the subject referred to by Mr. Stern; but if it is any satisfaction to him, I will say that certainly he is not in league with me in any sense. The challenge is entirely *bona fide*, both as regards the giving and the accepting. Having said thus much, I address myself to his arguments. He asked me where the originals of the New Testament are. I presume he believes in the writings of Moses, and I ask him if he is prepared to say where the originals of those writings are? I know he cannot: yet he believes in Moses, whence I argue that he cannot logically object to my belief in the New Testament, on the ground that I cannot produce the very documents written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, and others. There are certain obvious and universally recognised principles on which documents are received as authentic, though the originals are absent. The literary world believes in Herodotus and other ancient writers, although the originals are not in existence. The absence of the originals is no evidence against their genuineness. If it is, Mr. Stern must not believe in Moses: but he does. He does so on the generally-accepted rules of evidence referred to — rules that do not depend upon the arbitrary maxims of the schools, but are based upon natural laws of evidence, that enable us to lay hold with absolute confidence upon certain documents as written at certain times by certain men, although we are not in possession of the originals. The people contemporary with the production of a thing, have knowledge of the inception of that thing, and if among them obtains a certain universal reputation upon evidence which they are in a position to judge of as to its truthfulness, such

as the authorship of a book, that reputation is evidence to after posterity. If a book produced in Birmingham passes current among those who have opportunities of knowing the facts of the case, as the production of a certain individual, and the authorship is not questioned, succeeding generations are justified in receiving that generally-accepted reputation or impression as evidence of the authorship. When in addition to this uncontradicted reputation, the internal evidence of the work itself accords with the outside reputation, the evidence is of a character that can never be overturned. And it will be my duty in the course of this discussion to show that the New Testament is supported by this class of evidence, and that the evidence is collaterally strengthened in many ways; evidence which is certainly not to be disposed of by the sweeping assertions which Mr. Stern has made. It is not sufficient for him to *say* that the New Testament is a forgery. Let him *show* it. I *deny* that it is a forgery. I am prepared to prove not only its authorship, but that every part of it agrees with every other part, and not only so, but that in its entirety, the New Testament agrees with every part of the Old Testament. To start with, I put forward the book. It is *prima facie* evidence of itself. When Mr. Stern brings evidence of forgery, I will go into it. At present my assertion must go for what it is worth, as against his assertion.

Mr. Stern speaks of Jesus having no father. This is a misrepresentation: Jesus had a Father. That Father was the Father of Adam. How did Adam come upon the scene? Was there not a divine Father? Do not Mr. Stern's own writings say "Have we not all one Father?" Is that not the God of his nation? It is; and if the God of his nation could be the father of Adam, and he could find no difficulty in receiving that, why should there be a difficulty in the God of his nation being the father of Jesus? Abstractly there need be no difficulty whatever.

I proceed to prove that it is even so, that the God of his nation was the father of Jesus, and that therefore Jesus does not present the ludicrous instance depicted by Mr. Stern, of a man without a father. Mr. Stern speaks as if I referred to the New Testament for proof of my argument of the seventy weeks; and because he denies the New Testament, he thinks the argument is gone. This is altogether a mistake. I rely first upon the historical fact which he will not question, that Jesus of Nazareth appeared 1,800 years ago. I next point to the fact that this admitted date of his appearance coincides with the period fixed by the prophecy of the seventy weeks for the appearance of the Messiah. This argument is strong. The difficulty for him is great, and to get out of that difficulty he certainly resorts to extraordinary tactics. He says the weeks are literal weeks. Does this help him out of his difficulty? It only makes the difficulty greater, for if his argument is sincere, the Messiah ought to have appeared about 450 years before the crucifixion of Jesus. Did the Messiah appear at the end of seventy literal weeks? No! Mr. Stern will tell you that the Messiah has not yet appeared at all. No Messiah appeared seventy weeks after the mission of Nehemiah to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, but there did appear 490 (or seventy weeks of) years after that date, Jesus of Nazareth, who

claimed to be the Messiah, and who gave such irresistible evidence, that thousands of Jews, as Mr. Stern is bound to admit, accepted him, and preached the fame of him to other nations: as one result of which we have a gigantic political system all over Europe, which bears the name of Christ on all its records.

Is it so that seventy weeks do not mean seventy weeks of years? Is Mr. Stern seriously prepared to abide by his assertions that Daniel always means literally what he says? (MR. STERN: Hear, hear.) Very well, let us look at another part of Daniel. In the 8th chapter of that book, we have another prophecy, in which a period of time is defined. At the 8th verse we read that:—

“The he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn (between his eyes) was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came forth a little horn. And it waxed exceeding great towards the south, and towards the east, and towards the pleasant land. And it (the little horn of the goat) waxed great, *even* to the host of heaven; and it cast down *some* of the host and of the stars to the ground and stamped upon them.”

Is this a description of literal events that were to take place? Was a little horny substance coming out of the head of a beast, to stamp the stars under its feet? (MR. STERN: Yes; if it wasn't a little horn, I don't know what Daniel meant.) We have the matter explained. That goat was the symbol of the Grecian power, and the horns refer to the sub-divisions of that power, as we read in verses 21 and following: “The rough goat is the king, or kingdom of Greece; and the great horn between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation.” Then we read of a certain little horn budding out of one of the four, representing the Roman power which should make its appearance in one of the four divisions of the Grecian empire. In connection with the movements of that little horn we have a definition of time, 13th verse:—

“Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall *be* the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto TWO THOUSAND and THREE HUNDRED days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.”

I ought to have said that the vision, as a whole, as you will see by reading the chapter through, represented the prevalence of the Persian, Grecian and Roman powers over the Jewish polity. Out of one of the four divisions of the Grecian empire, according to what we find at the close of this chapter, appeared the Roman power, concerning which it is said at the 24th verse:—

“And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and *he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and SHALL DESTROY THE MIGHTY AND THE HOLY PEOPLE.*”

What power has destroyed the Jewish nation? The Roman. Now, here is a question. Over what length of time does this vision extend, which began with the appearance of a ram representing the kingdom of Media and Persia, and ending with the indefinite triumph of a power appearing first in Grecian territory? Mark the answer, which will be found at the 14th verse: "Unto *two thousand and three hundred* DAYS; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Now the period of time from the appearance of the Medo-Persian empire, to the destruction of the Jewish nation by Rome (which is a mere fragment of the period covered by the vision), was over 600 years—six centuries. But the length of the vision is defined as 2,300 days, and if literal days, less than seven years. According to Mr. Stern's way of treating the seventy weeks, this is the fact. According to him, we are to read this prophecy thus: Persia will arise, Greece will arise, Rome will arise and tread the Jewish people under their feet, *all in seven years!* This shows the absurdity of his argument. The period is spread out before us in history. We can look back to that long, dismal, black vista of years, and we can see the Jews trampled under foot for more than 2,000 years. We are living at the expiration of that period, when the sanctuary shall be cleansed. History tells us that the 2,300 days were significant of years. Mr. Stern himself will be obliged to admit it. He is obliged, in the case of the seventy weeks, to resort to quibble to get out of the facts which tell so fatally against his rejection of Jesus of Nazareth.

I will now resume the chain of evidence which I was proceeding to trace when called to time. I was producing evidence that Jesus was the seed of David. I next produce the case of Paul. It is impossible upon the principles of honest criticism to deny the historic reality of the apostle Paul: and I don't know that in all the efforts of scepticism I ever heard of the attempt being made. It is a moral impossibility that such letters as bear his name could be produced either by an imposter or a fiction writer. I presume Mr. Stern will not deny that Paul was a Jew — a man brought up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel — who stood in friendly relation to the head quarters of the Jewish opinions — who was acquainted with the public genealogies. Now, with all these means of information at his command, Paul says in Romans 1:3: "Jesus Christ our Lord was made of *the seed of David according to the flesh,*" and he repeats the statement in 2nd Timothy 2:8; he says: "Remember that Jesus Christ, *of the seed of David,* was raised from the dead according to my gospel." Last of all, we have the evidence of Jesus himself, in whose resurrection Paul, though a bitter rejecter, like Mr. Stern, came to believe, through a personal interview. This very personage proclaims himself to be of the house of David in the last chapter of Revelations: "I am the root and the *offspring of David.*"

Therefore in respect of the lineal extraction of Jesus, I submit that the evidence is conclusive that in that particular, Jesus of Nazareth answers to the requirements of the prophets.

The next point is that the Messiah was to be born in a certain place. In Micah 5:2, it says:—

“But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel.”

Where was Jesus of Nazareth born? We have the evidence. It is contained in the 2nd of Matthew, where we find that the chief priests and scribes, the head men of Mr. Stern’s nation, at that time, were distinctly under the impression that the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem. I presume Mr. Stern entertains the same notion, though he does not believe the Messiah has yet appeared; that from that now ruined and dilapidated village, the Messiah shall come. In Matthew 2:1, we read:—

“Now when Jesus was born in *Bethlehem in Judea*, in the days of Herod the king, behold there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews, for we have seen his star in the east, and have come to worship him.”

If any one objects to Matthew’s authority, we have the authority of Luke, Paul’s companion in travel, which you cannot overturn. In Luke 2:4, we read:—

“And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called *Bethlehem*; (because he was of the house and lineage of David.)”

The sixth verse says:—

“And so it was that whilst they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night. And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.”

So that the Christ of the New Testament, at all events, answers to the Messiah of Jewish prophecy, in being born at the right time, of the right family, and in the right place.

I come to another point. The Messiah of Jewish expectation was to be born of a virgin. I refer to Isaiah 7:14, whereat Mr. Stern smiles, for he no doubt thinks I have let myself into a trap; but I have not done so. I am well aware of the difficulties that are thrown against this passage. The passage is:—

“Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.”

The word for “virgin” is *almah*, which I will contend is a proper distinct

substantive for an unmarried female. The rejecters of Jesus say that it means young woman. Well, a virgin is a young woman, so that even supposing they were right, the word does not exclude virginity. But they are not right. This is proved by the fact that in all other places in which the word is used, it is applied in the sense of unmarried females. I will read to you all the cases in which the word occurs, and you shall be the judges whether or not it is used in the sense in which I seek to apply it. In the 24th of Genesis, the "virgin Rebecca goes forth to meet the servant of Abraham." I suppose that Mr. Stern will deny that Rebecca was a virgin. In Exodus 2:8, the maid the sister of Moses, who was living with the mother of Moses, went and called the child's mother unto her—that is, to the daughter of Pharaoh, who had picked up Moses.

Time being called, Mr. Roberts resumed his seat amid some interruption.

MR. STERN: I do hope you will allow Mr. Roberts a fair hearing, and let him explain those Hebrew words as well as he possibly knows how, whether they be correct or not. If I did not feel in a position to answer all that Mr. Roberts may have to bring forward, I should not have come here, and if you are afraid that I shall not be able to maintain my position I will kindly ask you to retire. I am perfectly satisfied that I am quite capable of answering all that Mr. Roberts has to say on the subject, and I pray you will leave it to me. Mr. Roberts has taunted me with committing sin in reading the New Testament, or with being ignorant of its contents. I still hold that it really is a sin, not alone to read the New Testament, but for a Jew to have it even in his possession. But I have undertaken this subject for the purpose of getting to the truth of the matter. You must understand that the Jews are continually pestered with a lot of missionaries, who tell us we are blind, when we can see; that we are lame, when we can walk; and deaf and dumb, when we can hear and speak. I consider it is high time for us to come forward and give our opinion on such books, which were written in our language and to us; and I consider that whenever a missionary lays down his gauntlet and gives battle to the Jews, we ought to come forward and give such opinions as we know, and such explanations as we have been brought up to on those words — the Hebrew. There was only one excuse, and that was intolerance. We have to-day in England the same liberties as any other creed. There are no thanks due to you. These are due to those who have passed away. The liberty that we enjoy to-day has been very dearly purchased, and I think it would be a pity if the Jews did not come forward to take up such subjects as these. I will admit that I have read the New Testament; that I have committed sin; and I hope the Almighty will forgive me, having done so in my search after truth. Besides, Mr. Roberts would never wish me to come here without having read it. One question he asked me: If seventy weeks do not mean seventy years, how long is the prophecy to last? I acknowledge that I do not know. According to the gospel of Mr. Roberts it means seventy times seven years. Why did not Daniel say so then? Why did not God inspire Daniel to say that seventy

weeks means seventy times seven years? He asks me whether “a little horn” means “a little horn”? Well, if a little horn doesn’t mean a little horn, I don’t know what it does mean. Then to go to Moses to show the authority of the New Testament! It is part of my task to show what Messiah we expect (Impatience). If you are impatient you can take your departure. I will instruct the door-keeper to return you the money you have paid. (The manifestation of impatience still continuing, the Chairman appealed to the audience to allow each speaker to say what he liked in his own time). My friend says that the Jews have always refused the subject, that we have rejected the Messiah. Well, now if the Jews at the time of Jesus, expected the Messiah, what would be more natural when he did come than that they should have accepted him? But they did reject him, and I consider that is quite sufficient proof that he was not the Messiah. Mr. Roberts, in 1871, comes forward and says he was; the Jews who lived at the time, and understood the Hebrew as well as Mr. Roberts does to-day, proved that he was not. He tells us that the New Testament is sufficient to show that the gospels cannot be false. It is admitted beyond all doubt that the present New Testament is so bad, that it requires a new New Testament to replace it. There is at present sitting in London, a synod of the greatest intellects that the present generation probably can produce, for no other purpose than to revise and replace this New Testament by another one. Why does it want revising? We Jews do not want any revision of ours. We are satisfied with things just as they are. But my friend says that until I proved the discrepancies and the things which contradict each other in the New Testament, he will not answer my statement. Well, I will just see if I cannot quote one or two. One law which I quote from our Bible, is this: “Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.” I believe that is a law which everyone of you would be willing to accept, and would uphold, and would like everyone to obey. Now, supposing I am to embrace Christianity, what then? Before I can embrace Christianity I am told this: “If any man come to me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.” There is another law: “Thou shalt not kill;” but the New Testament says, Luke 19:27: “But those mine enemies (these are Christ’s words), which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and *slay them* before me.” Well now, that is enough for the present to show me that they don’t agree with what is in the Old Testament. I have only made two quotations. I will now proceed to the 7th of Isaiah. My friend says that in that chapter he finds a statement made, which proves that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. Well, now I dare say that most of you are acquainted with this part, but it so happens that he has quoted just a few words in the centre of the sentence, leaving out the context. Now with your permission I will just read the beginning of it:—

“And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but

could not prevail against it. And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field; and say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking fire-brands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal: thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will believe, surely ye shall not be established. Moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David; is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know how to refuse the evil and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

And so it goes on to the 8th chapter, where it says:—

"Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz. And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah. And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then said the Lord to me, call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz. For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, my father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria."

As far as I can understand this, it seems very intelligible. Ahaz was frightened of two kings who were coming against him, and so Isaiah went to him and said: "Do not be frightened; they won't prevail against you." Ahaz did not believe him.—My time is up.

MR. ROBERTS: I suppose, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Stern wishes you to understand that in Isaiah 8, we are to find the fulfilment of the prediction contained in the seventh concerning the birth of Immanuel, of a virgin. I understand so from his quotation.

MR. STERN: Don't anticipate what I have to say.

MR. ROBERTS: We are told that the prophet went to the prophetess, and the result was the appearance of a child called Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Now names, according to Hebrew practice, are significant of some meaning. That is, they express some fact concerning the child or the circumstances to which it is related. The meaning of Immanuel, for that was to be the name of the child (referred to in chapter 7), of the virgin, is *God with us*. I presume Mr. Stern will not object to that definition. Now, what is the meaning of Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Is Maher-shalal-hash-baz the equivalent of Immanuel? It is not. It means "In making speed to the spoil, he hasteneth the prey." It was a proper name bestowed with regard to the events predicted in the previous chapter — the desolation of Syria and Ephraim at the hands of the king of Assyria.

Besides, what a curious thing it would be if *almah* in Isaiah 7:18, didn't mean a virgin—"The Lord himself shall give you a sign"—a marvel, a token, a wonder. Is it a very extraordinary thing that a young woman should have a baby, a married young woman? The idea of God selecting an incident of every-day occurrence as a sign, is sufficiently absurd to bring its own condemnation. The sign which the prophet here says God would give to Ahaz was to be a real sign and a sign direct from God. The name of Immanuel pointed forward to a flesh-manifestation of God himself in connection with a virgin of the house of David. And if Mr. Stern asks why that was intimated in connection with an immediately-impending local calamity about 700 years before Christ's appearance, my answer is to be found in the promises made to his own fathers. The purpose of God with Israel reaches forward to a definite pre-purposed result, that in Abraham and his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, and his seed should possess the gate of his enemies. That it is a long-standing promise that the seed of Abraham is to prevail over all enemies, Mr. Stern will admit. Now, here was Ahaz confronted with a great military confederacy threatening the destruction of Israel. We are told that the hearts of the people in Jerusalem were moved like trees shaken by the wind. This crisis is selected as a fitting occasion for the introduction of the promise of a token that God would deliver Israel not only from Rezin and Pekah, but from all enemies on the face of all the earth, in all time succeeding to the deliverance. The token was to be the appearance of a child to be named Immanuel. Immanuel is none else but the Messiah. This is shown by the connection to which I invite Mr. Stern's attention. There is not only a local application, but a pointing forward to the Messiah himself, if you trace the prophecy through. It culminates in these words:—

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with

judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.”

The concluding declaration of this splendid prediction, that it is a matter in which the zeal of the Lord of hosts is to be the instrument, fittingly tallies with the words, “The Lord himself shall give you a sign”; and gives special significance to the bestowal of the name Immanuel upon this marvellous child. But not seeking to dwell unduly on one point, I will just for a moment notice the objections Mr. Stern has brought forward in disposal of the New Testament. They are just of the character I expected. He quotes “Thou shalt not kill,” and contrasts with this the prospective words which Christ employs concerning himself: “Bring them hither and slay them before me.” It is really too idle to deserve notice. Does Mr. Stern mean to say that the command not to kill, was to apply in all possible circumstances? If so, how does he understand the stoning of Achan for trespass, or the slaughter of the Canaanites, when Israel crossed the Jordan under Joshua? The command not to kill had to do with ordinary civil relations. It is not inconsistent with the judicial function which the very same law prescribes. So though Christ was under the law of Moses in the days of his flesh, this is not inconsistent with the fact that he is to exercise judicial power in the day of his glory. I should like to know how he reconciles the objection with his own idea of the Messiah. Is it not written of him that he shall slay the wicked? (Isaiah 11:4). Now, though Mr. Stern does not believe Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, he must believe that when the Messiah does come, he will “slay the wicked.” How then about “thou shalt not kill?” If it is a contradiction against Jesus, it is a contradiction against Moses, against Joshua, and against the Messiah himself, even if Jesus were not he. It is a contradiction which does not exist. The precept not to kill is one regulating private life, but does not interfere with the judicial right to take away life when the general interests call for it. Who calls into question the prerogative of the Queen, in the name of the public well-being, to take away the life of a murderer?

Mr. Stern next introduces a matter which is a little more plausible on the face of it, but no more substantial in reality. Moses says, “Honour thy father and thy mother,” against which Mr. Stern quotes the saying of Christ, that we are to “hate father and mother.” Now, I claim that Christ be allowed to explain himself, and I presume that if Christ were here, as he was once face to face with his antagonists, Mr. Stern would not deny him that privilege. I contend that his employment of “hate” is to be construed in the light of his own teaching. He says that a man must hate his own life. Does Mr. Stern contend that he therefore taught a man to commit suicide? No. In what sense were they to hate father and mother, sister and brother, husband and wife? In Matthew 10 he says “Think not that I am come to send peace on earth,” (Mr. Stern: Hear, hear)—that is, at that time. “I came not to send peace but a sword,” and the history of the world since that time has shown the truth of his words. “I am come to set son against father.” How? Let history illustrate. Sons who received Christ were estranged from fathers

who did not receive him. They could only retain their friendship by denying Christ, but Christ called upon them to hate father rather than let love of father induce them to please father by rejecting him. They were not to love father more than him. He demanded to be put first. His words are "He that loveth father or mother *more than me*, is not worthy of me," and "he that findeth his life shall lose it." Therefore the contradiction Mr. Stern would make out is a contradiction only in appearance, which will only impress those not accustomed to look below the surface. So much for his alleged "contradictions"; and I will undertake to demolish every contradiction that he can possibly bring up, in the same way.

He asks how it is that the people in London are preparing a new version. The answer is so very obvious that it is a wonder it did not occur to Mr. Stern. In the 300 years that have elapsed since the present version was written, certain English words have passed out of use; and it is merely a question for the most part of substituting for obsolete words, words of modern usage. The use of such arguments against the New Testament is evidence either of the want of logical skill on the part of Mr. Stern, or a little want of something else which I need not particularly mention.

He says that because a few Jews rejected Christ, that is sufficient evidence to him that Jesus was not the Messiah. I should like him to define the principle upon which this argument is based. If he could say *every* Jew rejected Jesus, I could understand the argument. If every Jew contemporary with Jesus rejected him, there would certainly be strong ground for Jews of all subsequent ages to take the same attitude; but all Jews did not reject him. Thousands of Jews accepted him; and the subsequent belief in him by the Gentiles, was owing to the activity of Jewish preachers. Will Mr. Stern deny this? He cannot. The Gentiles accepted Jesus because Jews came out from Jerusalem and declared he was the Messiah. Therefore when talking of the Jews who rejected Jesus, let him not forget the multitudes of Jews who accepted him. Let him try to explain to himself why the believers believed. If he takes the scepticism of a part of the Jewish nation as proof that the Messiah has not come, how does he ask me to deal with the belief of those who believed in him? Let him remember that belief is of more weight than unbelief, for belief is the result of positive reasons: whereas unbelief may be the mere result of ignorance of evidence that exists. Those who were farthest from the evidence were those who rejected him; the Scribes and Pharisees, who stood apart in an attitude of hostility, stung to the quick by Christ's denunciation; for he told them to their faces that they merely appeared righteous, but inwardly they were like the beautiful graves that contained rottenness and dead men's bones. It is no wonder that the Scribes and Pharisees rejected him and that the nation under their leadership rejected him. Their rejection is no evidence against him at all. A large section of the common people heard him gladly, and at one time they wanted to take him by force, and make him a king, but the time had not come, and he took occasion to withdraw from them.—(Time called.)

MR. STERN: Mr. Roberts commenced by referring to my objection as far as honour thy father and mother is concerned, and in answer to what I advanced he said he must allow Christ to explain himself. Now Christ is represented to say something to the effect that no preference to father or mother must be shown before him. I believe I understand that. But I have to say that so far as I am concerned, if Christianity really requires me to hate my father or mother, brother or sister, and really requires me to hate my own life before I can accept Jesus to be the Messiah and my Saviour, then I most solemnly declare that I will never hate them. Then my friend says, if I do not believe in the New Testament, I do not believe in the Old. That is very logical, I must say. The subject of the discussion is "Was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah?" Now before I came here, he knew that I believed in the Old and he knew that I did not believe in the New. What is the use of him telling me that if I do not believe in the New, I do not believe in the Old? We have always believed in the Old and rejected the New; we have always looked upon the New as a compilation of falsehoods and forgeries. But I will reserve this subject for another occasion. I will proceed to Isaiah. My friend asks me, does Maher-shalal-hash-baz mean Immanuel? We are not discussing that; we are discussing was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah or not. I will ask him does Jesus mean Immanuel? Is Jesus the equivalent for Immanuel? He says every name in Hebrew has a meaning. So it has, and among every nation. But he says there is a particular meaning in Immanuel. He says Immanuel means "God with us." Of course it does, but we have got lots of Immanuels among us, and I should consider it would be the height of presumption on my part to assume that God is with us in consequence. He says if "virgin" does not mean a virgin, what does it mean? Well now in the first place I hold that the passage here is not properly translated. You must understand that it was translated by people who had an interest in translating it for themselves. The words spoken by Isaiah to Ahaz were given to Ahaz as a sign during the time that he was there, so that he might not fear those enemies who were coming against him. "The Lord himself shall give you a sign." It would be a very nice sign to tell Ahaz—suppose I were to go to him and say "Don't be frightened; God is with thee; as a proof of which in 700 years' time a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel." That would be a good sign and very comforting to Ahaz, wouldn't it? He must die first to get to know the truth of it. If Ahaz had any reason in him, he would prefer to take the matter in hand and stand and fight the battle out. But my friend made rather a joke of the words spoken by Isaiah. There is nothing very wonderful for a woman to bear a son, but it is certainly beyond my comprehension how she could bear a son without a father. That is unreasonable. But here are words as part of the statement. You must understand that the word (*aalmha*) means a young woman; (*hoo-aalmha*) "that young woman" or "this young woman." There is a young woman—(*hoorou*). She has already conceived, and she shall bear a son, and his name shall be called Immanuel. He alluded to his own wife, who was then near her confinement, for farther on it says he took witnesses to record and went unto

the prophetess, who was then in labour and she had a son. But, says my friend, Maher-shalal-hash-baz does not mean Immanuel. But of course it does mean something. It is a matter to explain, and I have come to give my view of the matter. It says that before a child should be three years old, these two firebrands were to be cut off. Now how can anyone possibly think that this refers to Jesus who was not born till 700 years later? Well, now Mr. Roberts quotes other places where it means virgin, and I admit that he is quite correct; but even there it is not properly translated. Some words in Hebrew require three, four, five, six, and sometimes seven English words to represent them, and some words could not be translated into English at all. There is the word *bas kol*. If you look at the English translation it is *beth kol*; and perhaps if I were to ask you what it means, you would not be able to tell me though it is in your own translation. But I will prove to you that my friend is so far in error on this point, for although the word *aalmha* can be used for a young woman who is a virgin, where virginity is meant to be particularly expressed, the word *peseeloo* must always be used. I not alone challenge any Hebrew scholar who is here, but any Hebrew scholar from any part, to disprove my statement of this fact. Although I admit the word *hoo-aalmha* can be used as implying a virgin as well as *peseeloo*, yet where the word *peseeloo* is particularly necessary the word *hoo-aalmha* can never be introduced. So much for his argument about the virgin. Let us now see if I cannot find one or two other things that he has said. He says we must not doubt the New Testament doctrine, for the simple reason that it has been accepted by the majority of Christians, and he says we must not go by those who rejected it, but only by those who accepted it. I am prepared to prove to you in the words of Mosheim himself, that the Jews who embraced Christianity in the first century, were the same as those who embrace Christianity to-day. The most ignorant, Mosheim says—but I think I had better read it in his own words:—“Therefore Jesus chose, out of the multitude that attended his discourses, twelve persons whom he separated from the rest by the name of apostles. These men were illiterate, poor, and of mean extraction, and such alone were truly proper to answer the views of the divine Saviour.” I believe that to be correct. I believe that Christianity is only suitable for the most ignorant and most poverty-stricken people, and those of mean extraction; but any men who have intellect at all, and who wish to use their reason, I am perfectly satisfied are not the people to embrace Christianity.

MR. ROBERTS: The argument to which Mr. Stern has treated you, upon the Hebrew words *almah* and *bethoolah**, would just be as good in my mouth with regard to the English word “maid” and virgin. The etymology may point more clearly to virginity in one case than the other, but conventionally (and, after all, it is the usage that determines the meaning of a word) they are both equally strong. The grammatical axioms, upon which Mr. Stern has been working his argument,

* This is the same word as *peseeloo* (used by Mr. Stern), but differently pointed, and consequently pronounced differently.

have been generated in the controversy that has been carried on for the last 1,800 years between Jews and Gentiles. It is, of course, inconvenient to the Jews that the virgin spoken of should really mean a virgin; and so they have whittled it away, until, so far as definition goes, they have got all the meaning out of it. But it avails nothing. So Mr. Stern relies on the collateral bearings of the question. He lays stress on the pronoun "you". He insists that this must be applied to Isaiah's contemporaries. The answer to this is to be found in and is characteristic of the language of God, which illustrates what He himself says: "As heaven is high above the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts higher than your thoughts." When He says a thing, it has more than an immediate bearing. It extends to the whole scope of the matter. When He says "you", in His communications with Israel, it is a national "you", and not necessarily restricted to the generation to whom it is addressed. We have a notable illustration of this fact in Deut. 18:15. Applying the word used to that generation, we should see where Mr. Stern would be landed. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." This is said concerning the Messiah, by Moses, to the Jews, three thousand years ago. Mr. Stern believes that the Messiah has not yet appeared, and, therefore, God didn't mean His words to apply to that generation, as would appear, by a narrow construction of them, to be the case. This ought to dispose all reasonable men to believe that when God said He would give "them", in Israel's day, a sign, He referred to the nation as a whole.

But Mr. Stern contends that this child was born within a year of the time of the prophecy. Very well; please observe this: "Before the child shall know how to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings!" Therefore, within three years (at the outside) from that time, Ephraim and Syria should have been broken. How will this agree with the 8th verse of the very same chapter: "The head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within **threescore-and-five years** shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people." According to Mr. Stern's construction of the sign of the child, it ought to have been broken within *three* years, because it was to happen before the child should know how to refuse the evil and choose the good. This shows the erroneousness of Mr. Stern's argument. The prophecy can apply to Christ alone, who answered both the local and other circumstances of the case. But, says Mr. Stern, Jesus does not mean Immanuel. It does. What is the derivation of Jesus? Mr. Stern must know well that Jesus is the mere Greek dressing of Yah-hoshua—otherwise Joshua; which means God (Yah), shall save (shuah). Therefore, the name "Jesus" expresses the same doctrine as Immanuel: viz., that the child so named was God-manifest in the flesh, sojourning with Israel for their salvation. But see how his question recoils upon himself. He says the child referred to is the child whose birth is recorded in the succeeding chapter — Maher-shalal-hash-baz. How is this? How does he reconcile the name Maher-shalal-hash-baz with the predicted name Immanuel? I have shown the doctrinal

identity of Jesus and Immanuel. I ask him to do the same with Maher-shalal-hash-baz.

I shall now proceed with the line of evidence I was pursuing, and which I shall pursue more deliberately to-morrow night. When Mr. Stern speaks of the uselessness of quoting the New Testament in which Jews do not believe, he does not understand my argument. My argument is not that they have to believe the things I quote from the New Testament because they are there: I quote these things to show that the matters declared concerning the Messiah, in the Old Testament, are fulfilled in the Messiah presented in the New. If this is established, and the New Testament be proved to be true, my argument is unanswerable. That is the question; and I will say that the evidence of the truthfulness of the New Testament is the biggest gun I have to fire. I will prove that the New Testament is true, and that Jesus rose from the dead. If I prove that, the Messiahship of Jesus is established. My argument, at present, is that Jesus answers to all the characteristics of the Messiah foretold in Moses and the prophets. I have shown this in three particulars, the time, the place, and the family.

Now I proceed to a fourth. The prophets teach that the Messiah should not be of purely human extraction, but should have God for his father. I refer first to Psalm 116:16, which though not irresistibly to the point, is in harmony with the idea presented in Isaiah 7. The Messiah speaks thus: "Oh Lord, truly I am thy servant; I am thy servant and *the son of thine handmaid*; thou hast loosed my bonds". By the two taken together, we are reminded of the necessity that Christ should be born of a virgin, arising out of the general prediction concerning him to be found in Gen. 3:17. There he is spoken of under a general figure. "*The seed of the woman* shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head." I ask Mr. Stern to give a reason why the words are not "the seed of the man." The seed of the woman was to be the instrumentality—the means of remedying the evil that came from the woman listening to the lie of the serpent. The woman being the cause of the transgression, in leading Adam astray, was to be the means also of deliverance from the condemnation into which, by her, he came. She was, apart from the man, destined to be the means of the introduction of the Saviour into the world. Hence the designation, "Seed of the Woman." I need not say how completely this is fulfilled in the birth of Jesus. But how could a child be born of a virgin? The account in Luke and Matthew is a complete answer. In Matthew we read: "That which is conceived in her is *of the Holy Spirit*". In Luke: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore, that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The womb of the virgin was preter-naturally quickened by the divine energy that formed all things in the beginning, and thus the product was a Son of God, answering to the before-time mysterious predictions of the prophets, which I proceed to continue to quote:—

“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.”

I ask Mr. Stern to explain how, upon Jewish hypotheses, the Messiah could bear the name of God. Why should he, individually, be described in the language here employed: “Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.” The New Testament supplies the reason. Jesus of Nazareth, as born of Mary, by the power of the Holy Spirit, was God’s offspring, and therefore, naturally, inherited the name of his Father. This is an explanation which the Christian system supplies, and which the Jewish system cannot; for the Jewish system says the Messiah is to be merely a man, merely the son of David. In this connection, I would introduce the argument employed by Jesus himself in controversy with the Jews on this very point. It was an argument they were not able to answer, and which Mr. Stern will not be able to answer. I refer to Matt. 22:42, where we read:—

“While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, *The Son of David*. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David call him Lord, how is he then his son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.”

I now ask the same question of Mr. Stern. Upon what principle, agreeable to Jewish genealogy, does David call his son “Lord”? There is an explanation in connection with Jesus of Nazareth which their system cannot afford. Jesus of Nazareth, as the Son of God, is higher than David, though born in the line of David according to the flesh. He is God manifest in the flesh, and, therefore, Lord of David. He says of himself, “I am the ROOT and the offspring of David” (Rev. 12:16); “The Father *who dwelleth in me*, he doeth the works” (John 14:10). “He that seeth me, *seeth him that sent me*” (John 12:4-5); “He that hath seen me *hath seen the Father also*” (John 14:9). Therefore, was Jesus greater than Jonah, greater than Solomon, greater than David; and, therefore, could David say as concerning the power that was his very origin, “He is my Lord”; although he could also say of Jesus as the flesh-medium of that power, “He is my son.” This, indeed, is the great mystery solved in the genealogy, which brings me back to a point I omitted to mention. It might be considered a strange thing that the genealogy of Joseph should be given, if Joseph were not the father of Jesus. But you will see that it was necessary; for if Mary were married to one who was not of the house of David, her individuality would be merged in his, here Davidic extraction would have been marred or covered, and the relation of the Messiah to David interfered with. Therefore, it was necessary that the husband of Mary, equally with Mary herself, should be a descendant of David. By this the Messiah, though not begotten of a human father, was, indubitably, David’s son.

Then it may be said — and this is another point that I expected Mr. Stern to bring forward; but he has not been quite so sharp as his co-religionist, Mr. Monaet, in the debate with Mr. Gratz — he has not laid hold of the point upon which Mr. Monaet insisted when he asked what relation Jesus was to David, since he can only establish his relation to David through a woman? — (Time called.)

MR. STERN: Mr. Roberts has had something very important to say on a point that I do not seem to have been so sharp upon as another gentleman. I am sorry for that; for however little I say, it brings out the greatest things of Mr. Roberts; but since the matter has been discussed, and since my Jewish brethren are satisfied that they have got the best of it, I do not see why we need feel disappointed. I am very pleased that we have had the greatest gun-shot. There is, therefore, no more danger — at least it will be fired in the first opening speech of to-morrow night. With regard to his statement of Isaiah to Ahaz, I hold that I have proved, to the satisfaction of this audience, that the word *hoo-aalmha* can never be used where the word *peseeloo* is necessary — I say, if I have proved it to your satisfaction — of course, I rely upon your sense of justice for that, for I am perfectly satisfied that you are not all Hebrew scholars, consequently you will have to leave it to a higher authority. If I have proved that, the whole argument of my friend falls to the ground. I have proved that it is a wrong translation, and that it does not really mean what Mr. Roberts would have you believe. I do not care what it does mean. My friend refers me to Genesis, and he made some statement about what sort of Messiah we did expect; if Jesus of Nazareth is not the one, if we expect someone else. I wish it to be plainly understood, and I hope Mr. Roberts will take notice of this, that I have not come here to discuss who our Messiah is to be; I have come here to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. It has nothing to do with what we expect. There is no doubt that among Jews there are differences of opinion, and I have no objection, on some other occasion, to discuss that subject, but since we are not here for that purpose, I hold it would not be treating the audience in a courteous manner if we discussed it now; for, instead of going on to discuss who was Jesus of Nazareth, I should have to bring forward what we expect. He will certainly puzzle me if he asks me such questions as this. He refers me to Gen. 3 about the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. I don't know whether that has anything to do with Jesus. Surely, he doesn't think that I shall deny that every man is the seed of woman as well as of man. I have no doubt that every one who stands here is of the seed of the woman. It certainly is not, as I say for the third time, a subject for me to discuss here. I will leave the matter with what I have said. But what wonderful things he tells us about the seed of the woman, which shall bruise the serpent's head. I say this is the most intelligible passage that can be read. It is not necessary to call it a prophecy; it is what anyone with any sense at all would see — that the serpent would probably bite the heel of the seed of the woman, and that the seed of the woman would break its head by striking it with a stick; more especially when we know that in eastern countries,

where men usually walk without shoes, serpents abound. What is more likely, than that a serpent will bite a man's heel, and that the man will turn round and strike it with a stick? Whether that is an argument that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, I will leave to your judgment. My friend said something about the established fact of Jesus having risen. Well now, the only fact that we have about him having risen, is that which is recorded in the New Testament. It seems to me most unreasonable for him to bring such an argument. Supposing you had a prisoner at the bar, accused of theft; if you asked him to explain matters, he would, no doubt, try to excuse himself. A statement is brought forward, which, at the outset of this question, he knew that I not alone doubted, but entirely disbelieved. He brings the New Testament to prove New Testament statements. What has that to do with me? But let us see what these inspired gentlemen, who were with Jesus, say. One of them, after being told that Jesus had risen, would not believe it. I allude to Thomas-a-Didymus. "But", they say, "we have seen him and conversed with him." "But that has nothing to do with me", Thomas says; "and unless Jesus appears to me, so that I may put my hand in his side, and put my fingers in the prints of the nails, I shall not believe." This is one of the disciples who was with Jesus at the time. Then my friend says we have got proofs. What proofs have we got? It was not proof enough for Thomas-a-Didymus when the eleven disciples, who were with him, actually saw Jesus; and if he would not take their own words for it, how much more reasonable for me to deny the statement to-day, 1,800 years after the event. And look how he was justified in his scepticism; for Jesus was kind enough to appear to him and say, "Reach forth thy hand and touch my side, and put thy fingers in the marks of the nails." Thomas then believed. And if Jesus will appear to me; if Jesus wishes really to save me — you are really in earnest, the same as I am at this moment — if Jesus has a desire to save a soul, as some call it — and mine wants saving as well as others — then I beg and pray let him come forth now; let Jesus in 1871 appear to me, so that I may put my hand into his side. (Hisses.) You may hiss as you like; I deny what you believe; I have come prepared to deny it. I have come here with a certain amount of sayings, and, whether you are pleased or not, I shall say them. I demand of you to hear me, in the name of Englishmen — in the name of liberty, for which we have not so much fought as we may have to do: the liberty which has been left by our forefathers, and which many of them purchased with their blood — I say it is reasonable in me to ask it, if Thomas-a-Didymus asked it. Let him come forth that I may put my fingers into the prints of the nails, then I shall believe. And yet, I don't know whether I would even then. Thomas-a-Didymus was with Jesus when he was alive; he would, probably, recognise him. I never saw Jesus, and if he were to come, I should not recognise him; and so it would be all the same.

Friends, I thank you for listening to my statement. To-morrow night we shall resume the subject. I have a great deal yet to say, which I will try to say in the most gentle way, so that it shall not hurt your feelings; but, unless you give me liberty of speech so that I may express my opinions freely; if you only allow Mr. Roberts to

say what he has got to say, and refuse to concede to me the same privilege, how will you be able to judge between us? We shall not get at the truth. I have come so that we may, once for all, settle this matter. It is quite right for one as well as another to express his opinions freely, and we may, perhaps, at the same time, get to understand one another, and if we get wrong, we may, perhaps, put it right; and who is more likely to do it than ourselves? I thank you kindly for your attention.

SECOND NIGHT,

Wednesday, October 18th, 1871.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the meeting to observe the patience exhibited on the previous evening, while the discussion proceeded.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and Gentlemen, after what Mr. Stern said last night, it is impossible to conceive by what sign he is to identify the Messiah when he comes. He said it was no business of his to define these signs; that he was here simply to deny that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. I submit that he misapprehended his duty. It is true he is here to deny that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, but how is he effectively to do this unless he shows that he does not answer to the signs by which the Messiah is to be known? And how can he show this without telling us what those signs are? Any argument short of this, must fail to justify the conviction which he is here to declare. Nay, he went further, and astonished us by saying that if Jesus of Nazareth himself were to re-appear, he is not quite sure that he would believe in him then. (Mr. Stern: Hear, hear.) Upon what ground? Would not his reappearance be evidence of his Messiahship? Mr. Stern says he does not know that he would be able to recognise him. If that would be an obstacle, how is he ever to believe in any Messiah? Has he ever seen his own Messiah? How is he to know him when he appears? If Jesus of Nazareth were to re-appear, that would be evidence that he was the Messiah. (Mr. Stern: No, no.) Mr. Roberts: Mr. Stern says "No". It will belong to the last stage of my plan of evidence, to press home that argument; to enter upon it at present would be to diverge from the plan I have laid down for myself. I, therefore, merely hint at it, and pass on to notice one or two other points. Mr. Stern said that since the disciple Thomas, called Didymus, said, "I will not believe that Jesus of Nazareth is risen, unless I have an opportunity of putting my finger into the marks of the nails, and my hand into his side", he is justified in taking the same position. I admit that this would be so, if Mr. Stern were in the position of Thomas, called Didymus. But Mr. Stern is not in that position. Thomas had no evidence of the resurrection of Jesus, beyond the assurances of his ten fellow disciples; and considering the circumstances under

which it was given, it is no wonder that it didn't carry conviction to the mind of Thomas. These circumstances require to be taken into account. The disciples were not expecting that Jesus would die. They were looking for his triumph over all enemies, and the establishment of his power over all the earth, as a deathless King. When, therefore, instead of this, he was taken prisoner, and actually crucified and buried, it staggered their faith, and drove all their hope in him to the wind. They knew not, as John tells us, the Scripture, that he should rise again from the dead. They were in a state of consternation and bewilderment. Is it a great marvel that in this state of things, Thomas, on hearing the statement of the ten disciples, that Jesus had risen, should say, on the spur of the moment, "After what has happened I will not believe, unless I have the opportunity of satisfying myself?" It was no wonder; it was an exceedingly natural position for him to take. But Mr. Stern's position is very different. Mr. Stern has in his possession, or at least may have, for I do not know whether he has given sufficient attention to the subject to be really in possession of such evidence as, fairly considered, would compel him in believing that which Thomas at the time doubted. He has just precisely the same reason for believing in Jesus, that he has for believing in Moses. I should like Mr. Stern to tell us why he believes in Moses; and I am sure if he gives us a reasonable definition, it will be a definition containing a reason for believing in Jesus. And then if he is so very anxious to keep Thomas company, why not keep him company to the end of the chapter? Thomas was a believer in the sequel; and the very fact that he took a sceptical attitude in the first instance, gives the strongest weight to the fact that subsequently he did believe. Indeed, we may accept it almost as a kindness of providence, that there should have been in the company of the disciples one who represented the searching spirit of modern criticism; for a man of the disposition to be in such circumstances convinced, is a standing argument to the end of the world. I submit, therefore, that Mr. Stern is not justified in using Thomas for a sceptical purpose. Such use cannot be logically sustained at all. Thomas's case is a stronger argument for belief, than the other ten disciples who never doubted. If Mr. Stern uses him to justify doubt, I use him to justify belief.

Mr. Stern says his fathers rejected Jesus of Nazareth, and therefore he is justified. I ask him if he is prepared to stand by that? Didn't his fathers reject and kill the prophets? — Moses himself not excepted, except in the matter of death. Why doesn't Mr. Stern reject them? Moses was rejected by his brethren. When he supposed that they would have understood how that God would, by his hand, deliver them, they said, "Who made thee to be a ruler and a judge over us?" and afterwards, when Moses was on the summit of Sinai, they said, "As for this Moses, we wot not what has become of him", and proposed to appoint a captain over them, to return to Egypt. In fact, if we go through the whole history of Israel, you will find the true prophets were always rejected, and the false ones always listened to. If, then, Mr. Stern rejects Jesus of Nazareth, merely because his fathers did so, is he not logically bound to reject the prophets also? Why does he

not say, "Because my fathers rejected Moses and Elijah, and all the prophets, I will do it?"

I will not condescend to notice the remarks with which he favoured you last night, in reply to my citation of the Edenic promise concerning the seed of the woman, beyond saying that it is puerile in the extreme, to suggest that God should deal with so trifling a matter in defining the moral relations of things, as the propensity of the serpent to bite a man's heel. I will rather pass on to the line of argument which I opened last night, and in which I had arrived at the point of applying the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the birth of Immanuel to Jesus. I will now remark that whatever may be said with regard to the prophecy on the score of obscurity, the balance of probability — putting it in the very mildest form — is in favour of the view I have presented. The Messiah of the New Testament answers to the peculiarity of that prophecy exactly, in that he was born of a virgin of the house of David, and I am fortunately not without good company in applying the prophecy to that fact. Matthew was a Jew; one Jew is at least as good as another. Matthew belonged to a party of Jews, the reality and potency of whose labours for the advancement of the truth, are evidenced even in the present constitution of political society. He was one of a band of men who sealed their testimony with their blood. Mr. Stern says he belonged to a band of illiterate men: so much the better for my argument. How came it that illiterate men moved the world? Illiterate men could never have done that in the capacity of illiterate men merely. There must have been a cause in operation with their illiterateness, to have produced so great a revolution as that which resulted from their efforts. The New Testament account reveals this cause, and gives the only rational explanation of their movement. They were personal witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus. They declared their personal knowledge, and "*God worked with them, confirming their word with signs following*" (Mark 16:20). This accounts for their perseverance, and their ultimate success. Take away this element, and you take away the explanation of a great historic fact that no man can gainsay. The illiterateness of the apostles, upon which Mr. Stern delights to dwell, I rely upon as in the circumstances, one of the strongest evidences of the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. Well, then, Matthew, one of this band of men, to whom Jesus made the promise that the Spirit should come and guide them into all truth, applies the prophecy of Isaiah in the way I am contending for; and therefore I am in good Jewish company. I refer to Matt. 1:22, where, in recounting the facts connected with the supernatural birth of Christ, Matthew says, "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord, by the prophet, saying, 'Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted, is God with us'".

There is a necessity not recognised by Mr. Stern and his party, but recorded by everyone of the prophetic writings, why the Messiah should be born, not of the will of man, but by the power of the Holy Spirit. I refer to the names that are bestowed in those writings upon the Messiah — names which are not intelligible on the supposition that the Messiah was to be a mere man. I proceed to give you a

few illustrations of this. In the 24th Psalm, we have this beautiful passage in connection with the Kingly manifestation of the Messiah—“Lift up your heads, oh ye gates, and be ye lifted up ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory?” The 10th verse, “THE LORD OF HOSTS, he is the King of Glory.” Upon what principle of Judaism can Messiah be styled “the Lord of Hosts, Yahweh of Armies, their God?” Can a mere man be Yahweh? But accept the Messiah of the New Testament and the difficulty is gone. God was manifest in the flesh, by that universal Spirit which radiates from Him, and which is the pabulum of all existence; by which the Creator is everywhere present, and by which when He manifests Himself, it is as much Himself as His own personal glory enthroned in heaven. That is the New Testament explanation of this prophetic mystery. I call upon Mr. Stern to give his explanation.

In Psalm 45:3, the Messiah is thus addressed:—

“Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the King’s enemies; whereby the people fall under thee. Thy throne, O God (*elohim*), is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom *is* a right sceptre.”

I ask him upon what principle a mere son of David is to be called the Elohim of Israel. Then in Isaiah 24:23, we read:—

“The moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously.”

I am one with Mr. Stern in expecting the Messiah to reign in Jerusalem as King — enthroned King of the whole earth, upon the holy hill that God has chosen. But who is it that is here described as “the LORD of Hosts”? Can a mere man, such as the Messiah of the Jewish expectation, be called the LORD of Hosts (Yahweh of Armies)? The description is exactly applicable to Jesus, for he is Jehoshua — LORD of Hosts — God manifest. Again, in Jer. 23:5, you find this:—

“Behold the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: *and this is his name whereby he shall be called* THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS — Yahweh (Jehovah) of Israel, our righteousness.”

Upon what principle is that applicable to a mere son of David, such as the Jews expect? It is applicable to a son generated by the spirit from a virgin of David’s house. Again, in Hosea 13 we find another and signal illustration of the same phrase. At the 4th and 9th verses, it says:—

“I am the Lord thy God, from the land of Egypt. Thou shalt know no God but me . . . O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thine help. *I will be thy King.*”

Where is there a man that can say, “I am the Lord thy God, from the land of Egypt?” In what sense is the uprise of a mere son of David a fulfilment of the promises of God, that HE would be their Messiah; which, in fact, is a prophetic parallel to the memorial name God took upon Himself at the bush — YAHWEH, *I will be*; to which, though in the English version translated “I am”, I suppose Mr. Stern will not object. “I will be thine Elohim, your Messiah.” How? Jesus, the word made flesh, is the explanation. But how could a mere flesh and blood son of David answer to the description? In Joel 3:17, we are told:—

“So shall ye know that *I am the LORD your God dwelling in Zion*, my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more.”

In Zeph. 3:14, we find another illustration of the same feature:—

“Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel, be glad and rejoice with all thy heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The LORD hath taken away thy judgments, He hath cast out thine enemy: *the King of Israel, even the LORD (Yahweh)*, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more.”

Clearly that applies to a time not yet arrived in the experience of Israel. But how can a mere son of David be described as “Yahweh in the midst of Israel?” If a mere son of David could be so described, why not David himself, for surely a father is equal to his son, on the principles before the Jewish mind in the consideration of this question? Let Mr. Stern find some place in the Holy Writings where David describes himself, or is described by the name Yahweh. I know that this he cannot do. But he is obliged to recognise the fact that that name is applied to David’s son — the Messiah. The question is, upon what principle? If the Messiah is a mere son of David — not the root as well as the offspring of David — why is he described by the name of David’s God? There is no answer on the Jewish hypothesis; but admit that the Messiah is son of David’s God, as well as son of David by Mary, and the difficulty vanishes. Then in Zech. 2:10-12:—

“Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, *I come, and I will dwell in the midst* of thee, saith the LORD. And many nations shall be joined to the LORD in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the LORD of Hosts hath sent me unto thee. *And the LORD shall inherit Judah, his portion in the Holy Land*, and shall choose Jerusalem again.”

This is a prediction of Israel’s national aggrandisement under their expected Messiah; and on the same subject, in the 14th chapter of the same book, 9th verse, we read, “And the LORD (Yahweh) shall be King over all the earth”, which agrees with the doctrine of his manifestation, which I have pointed out.

But further, this personage to come is described as the Son of God even in the Jews' own writings. In Psalm 2:7, we find the statement:—

“The LORD hath said unto me, *Thou art my Son*, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.”

In Zech. 12:8, the same feature is presented:—

“In that day shall the LORD defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and he that is feeble among them at that day, shall be as David, and the house of David *shall be as God*, as the angel of the LORD before them.”

How can a mere man of the house of David, constitute the house of David as if it were God? Jesus of Nazareth, the manifestation of God by His Spirit, does indeed exalt the house of David in his person to equality with God. This is the blasphemy the Pharisees charged against Jesus, in saying that he was equal with God, being the Son of God (John 5:18). Then in Isaiah 63:1, you have the same idea that is presented in the quotations I have made; all of which I press upon Mr. Stern's urgent attention, with a request that he will explain how they can be reconciled with the idea that the coming Messiah is to be a mere son of David:—

“Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment.”

I presume Mr. Stern will admit that this is a description of his Messiah in military operations against the Gentile nations, when the time comes for him to do for the world what Joshua did for the nations of Canaan. “For the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of *my redeemed* is come”. A mere son of David could never use such language, but Jesus of Nazareth could; for he by the Spirit was one with the God of Israel (John 10:30); as he also said, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also”. By this indwelling power, he was enabled to still the storm on the sea of Galilee.

Next and most conclusively of all: the Messiah promised in the prophets was to be a sufferer. He was to be rejected; he was to be put to death; in proof of which I rely first upon the prophecy of Daniel, with which Mr. Stern dealt so very weakly; in fact he did not deal with it at all, for he said he was not able to tell what the 70 weeks meant. That is a damaging fact in his case — that he should be unable to explain one of the principle predictions of one of his own prophets, concerning the Messiah — especially when that very prediction was the the foundation of a strong expectation entertained by his own nation, of the appearance of the Messiah, in the days of Josephus. The statement says that at the expiry of the period

mentioned there, the Messiah should be cut off. There can be no dispute as to the signification of the term "cut off". If Mr. Stern should raise any objection on the point, I will be prepared, from the writings of his own nation, to show that it means to die — to punish; as when we are told, for instance, that the wicked shall be (*kahrath*) *cut off* — the very word employed in the prophecy of Daniel. Why was the Messiah to be cut off? The explanation is given a verse or two before the statement in verse 24. This "cutting-off" manifestation of the Messiah is connected with the finishing of transgression, the making an end of sin, making reconciliation for iniquity, bringing in everlasting righteousness, and so forth. I call Mr. Stern's attention to the fact that the Messiah of the New Testament is taught to have accomplished these very things by his death, and it is a Jew that teaches it. Paul said Jesus "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"; and he (Jesus) was "made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption". There are numerous statements of this doctrine in the New Testament, but, as this is so well-known to be a doctrine of the New Testament, I need not quote further testimony. I will, at once, point out that in that respect, Jesus of Nazareth corresponds with the Messiah of Daniel 9. I call upon Mr. Stern to show in what way his expected Messiah is to fulfil that chapter.

I next quote the 53rd of Isaiah, which I invite Mr. Stern very specially to deal with:—

"Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the LORD revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground; he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely, he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet ye opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him. He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall

be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore, will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.”

MR. STERN: Mr. Chairman and friends, I must say that you have been very patient in listening to the speech of Mr. Roberts. There is great credit due to him for being able to deliver such a speech. But we have come here to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. We do not come here to listen to a lecture from Mr. Roberts upon the Old Testament. I don't think there is anything in the Old Testament but what I am perfectly acquainted with. I was quite prepared to hear all that he might have to say on the subject. Still, I asked him questions last night which I consider have never been answered. I asked him then to produce the originals of the New Testament. (Laughter.) You may laugh if you please, but at the same time I am quite serious when I ask you (turning to Mr. Roberts) to produce the originals of the New Testament. I have said, and I maintain it, that the New Testament is a compilation of falsehoods and forgeries, and until you can produce the originals, I will not believe in it. Who wrote Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; in what language, and to whom were they written, and where? You never so much as condescended to tell me anything about it. The only thing you did was to ask me to produce the originals of Moses. That is a nice way of answering a question. I must say I did intend to conduct this debate in the most amicable manner, but it will be impossible to do so if we go on in this way. This is merely a bandying of words. I have nothing to do with producing the originals of Moses; though if I undertake to discuss Judaism *versus* Christadelphianism, I shall have no objection to produce them. But I have come here for one purpose only — to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or not. I have nothing to do with producing the originals of Moses. What has that to do with the subject? Then my friend asked me, since I object to Jesus on the ground that I am not acquainted with him; that I never saw him; and if he appeared to me I should not recognise him, which is quite reasonable on my part, I should say; for I cannot recognise anyone that I have never seen. He asks “If your Messiah come, how will you recognise him?” I have not come here to discuss as to what Messiah we expect. He then compares Moses to Jesus. What a comparison! We look upon Moses as a man, not as a God. We revolt at the idea of man being God. That is what we object to. If you bring Jesus and tell me to believe in him as a man, leave the God theory out, I have no objection; but when you tell me he is a man, and yet the Son of God, I revolt against it, and won't have it. We only look upon Moses as a man, and not as son of God. A man can believe in a good many things that he has not seen. I have never seen Napoleon, nor Abraham Lincoln, but I believe there were such men. I know there is an Emperor of Germany. I could mention hundreds of people whom I have not seen, and yet whom I believe to exist; but

here you bring me people to believe in, upon authorities that the greatest intellects that have written upon the subject pronounce to be forgeries. See Mosheim, page 64, *Peregrinations of the Apostles*.

Of course that is just what I say. "The distance of time and the want of records". I won't believe these statements until you bring me the proper records. It is no use my going on to discuss the subject of the genealogy of Jesus at present; I must leave that alone until my friend brings further evidence on the subject. One of the answers my friend gave me last night was, that God who made Adam out of the dust, could so arrange that a man should be born without a father. Well now, this I hold; and if you are not satisfied, I am perfectly willing to leave it to the Chairman; if he will kindly undertake the trouble, or rather if he will undertake to decide whether I am in order or not. I hold that Mr. Roberts is out of order in asking such questions. I have not come here to discuss what God can do or cannot do; I have come to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or not. You bring me your books to prove that he was. You bring me the New Testament, in which I say I do not believe. I hold that you have to show that these records are true before I can accept them; but to say that God did one thing because He did another, is begging the question; I shall not trouble to answer such irrelevancies. My friend has quoted Isaiah 53. From the way in which he read this chapter, it would appear that every word referred to Jesus, but, with your permission, I will read it, and see if we cannot show its meaning to be quite different. What this has to do with the Messiah I really don't know. Isaiah says "who hath believed our report?" Now you know Isaiah was not speaking two or three years after Christ was crucified, or is reported to have been crucified — for I don't believe he was crucified — but about a thousand years before — I do not know the exact time. He says "Who hath believed our report?" speaking of the past; "and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" Certainly if Mr. Roberts had explained it we should have known better, but it cannot be Jesus; he was not born till nearly a thousand years afterwards. "For he shall grow up as a tender plant; he has no form nor comeliness, and when we should see him there is no beauty that we should desire him". How is it that some of you do desire him. You actually wish me to desire him, but I don't. "He is despised and rejected of men". It was only a few Jews who rejected him. "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief". I don't know what sorrows Jesus had. He could not have known any such sorrows as we have to-day. He was not obliged to get up at six o'clock in the morning, and go and slave away his life until six at night. (Hissing.) My friends, I told you last night that your hissing would not prevent me saying a word. (Renewed signs of disapprobation; the Chairman having to interpose his authority before perfect quietness was restored.) Besides, hissing was the cause of interrupting me in the middle of a sentence. But this is my first attempt at such a thing as this. How it will end I don't know — the Lord only knows. I was quoting this passage. "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." How this can be applied to Jesus I don't know, for the best part of his life we know nothing about him. One says he has

been in Bethlehem, another in Judea, another in Egypt, and another elsewhere; and the whole of his ministrations didn't last more than three years. I have gone through sorrows myself, but they have not come altogether, they have come gradually, and we take them in the best part. If Jesus had been married, and had a lovely wife, and his wife died, and he got married again, and perhaps had a wife he could not live so agreeably with, as you have heard is sometimes the case, you might have said he was acquainted with grief and sorrows. Or if he had children whom he loved, and they were cut off while young, you might say he was a man acquainted with sorrows and grief. But what sorrows and grief had Jesus? Why I cannot really see how that passage can be quoted at all in his favour. Why when the worst came to the worst, when he had not a farthing in the world, and when there were 500 people around him, he could feed them with a few loaves and fishes, and there could be gathered up seven baskets full of fragments. Surely there could be no sorrow there. If he had only left us that secret, what a different state of things there would have been now; no work-houses, no gaols. But this beautiful Son of God and Mary, this man without a father, this man who could do all these things, you say he was acquainted with sorrows! Show me the sorrows; what is the sorrow, when and where? My friend says all these things applied to Christ. Yes; they are applied to him by those who believe in Jesus. Why do they apply them? Because if they did not they would not have a Messiah. Whom was it done by? By a lot of people who thought it an act of virtue to deceive and lie for the purpose of defending anything in favour of the Church; by people who had no principle whatever. My friend who comes here to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, shows me a passage that I am sure has nothing to do with him. "He was despised and we esteemed him not". Well, now, if the Jews were to say so, there would be something in it; but since the Christians quote it in their favour, and since the Christians do esteem him, I do not see how it can be applied in his favour. "Surely he *hath* borne our griefs". How could Jesus, when he was not yet born? It does not say "He shall bear our grief". It says he *hath* borne our grief and carried our sorrows; and yet we did not esteem him stricken of God and afflicted". If this is not alluding to a personage who had lived before Isaiah spoke these words, then I must say words have no meaning at all. "He was wounded for our transgressions". Who was? Jesus? who was going to be wounded a thousand years after? "The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed". How can that apply to Jesus? He hadn't lived then. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all". On whom? You must understand that Isaiah, who is looked upon as one of the greatest of the prophets — of what I shall call the greater prophets — lived at a time when the Jews were not as he wished them to be, when they were probably as we are to-day — I must admit it — not very strictly obeying the laws of Moses. We certainly have not got such great men who can come to-day and give us their intellects and their time to bring us together and tell us what to do. But there was Isaiah then among the people, and

he, like a good man, went and told them of their faults. He said, "We have gone astray". He is including himself with the others. "The Lord hath laid upon him". Upon whom? "He shall lay upon him in a thousand years". That would have sounded strange. If words mean anything at all, they mean what he said. Of course, I must admit I have not been to an English school; what little I know of English I have had to pick up myself, but from what little I do know I consider — and if I am wrong, my opponent will inform me — that the sentence is in the past tense. "He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth". Why, if there was nothing else in this chapter, those very words would be sufficient to show that they were not referring to Jesus, "He was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth". Did not Jesus open his mouth? Who said "*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?*" "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Who said "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do". The passage is simply alluding to someone that had passed away, and who was oppressed and afflicted of God; and Isaiah said it was done for our sakes, and Isaiah consoles himself with that sentence; but it could never have been alluding to Jesus, for he actually did speak; he could not bear the excruciating pains when it came to the last moment. "He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation". I have yet to learn when Jesus was in prison. When my friend gets up, I shall want him to tell me what prison it was, and how long he was there. "And who shall declare his generation?" Why, Matthew and Luke: they declare it. We know the generation of Jesus; he was the son of Abraham, according to your theory. He was the son of Joseph, who was the son of Jacob, according to Matthew, and the son of Heli, according to Luke. But it seems to be made up in this way: if Jesus was born without a father, his mother's husband had two fathers, and so, between the two, we can reconcile them. But when was Jesus in prison? Is it such a difficult task? "Who shall declare his generation?" That is what you have been declaring these last two nights. "For he was cut off out of the land of the living. For the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death". This cannot be speaking of Jesus, because it all refers to the past. "Because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth". I shall be able to show that there was a great deal of deceit in the mouth of Jesus before I have done to-night. "Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief, when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed". I want to know if Jesus could see his seed when he never got married? It is simply alluding to a man who shall enjoy the pleasures of life, and live to see his children's children. But it is just as Mosheim has said, and my friend has admitted: the most ignorant people were the first that joined this beautiful Christianity, this loving faith of yours, and to ignorant people it is easily reconciled. I am not a learned man, but it does not require a great deal of learning to find that this passage speaks of a man who had come. "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied. By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their

iniquities.” How does he? Christ says, “Ye that would not that I should reign over you, bring them hither, and slay them before me?” That is the way he justifies them. Is that justification? “Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he hath poured out his soul unto death: he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors”. There is nothing of the sort. “He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved”. All we have to do is not to discuss; we want no theories, we want no ideas of people who have lived before us; all we want is people of the greatest ignorance that can come here and join issue with my friend, and repeat the words, “I believe in Jesus”. That is quite sufficient; we shall be saved. (Mr. Roberts: O no!). “He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned”. If these words do not mean that, I do not know what they mean. They seem to me plain language; in fact, too plain. I have tried, no doubt in the humblest possible way, to show that this chapter in Isaiah has nothing to do with Jesus. My friend may probably say who has it to do with? I am perfectly satisfied that it does not refer to Jesus. I am not bound to tell him what it does refer to. When I undertake to discuss Judaism *versus* Christianity, I shall be prepared to tell him whom it does refer to. I am perfectly satisfied that my friend is a learned man, and has given a great deal of study to these things; and just as I know to whom it alludes, I am perfectly satisfied that he knows the same.—(Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry to find, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Stern is so unacquainted with the writings of his own nation as to argue that the present tense, in the 53rd of Isaiah, can not have a future signification. Nothing is more frequent, in these writings, than the employment of the present tense, in prophetically depicting future scenes and events. For instance: in the 60th Isaiah we have the future glories of the Jewish nation thus introduced: “Arise, shine for thy light *is* come, and the glory of the Lord *is risen upon thee*”. According to Mr. Stern’s argument, this describes a state of things existent in the days of Isaiah, whereas he is here to-night to contend that the Light of Israel has not come. How does he get out of that difficulty? Again, in the 9th Isaiah, we read: “For unto us a child *is born*, to us, a son *is given*”. I presume Mr. Stern will not deny that this refers to the Messiah; for it goes on to say that “on the throne of David” he shall sit, and order and establish the kingdom for ever. Applying it, then, to his Messiah, and construing the tense of the verb as he would construe it with the 53rd chapter it would show that the Messiah had at that time appeared; whereas Mr. Stern denies that he has yet appeared. I might give many illustrations of the same thing.—“*I have made thee a father of many nations*”. God said to Abraham, when he as yet had had no child. Mr. Stern argues in ignorance of, or opposition to, the fact that divine language is based upon prescience; that God calleth “things that are not — (but which He intends to be) — *as though they were*”. The Spirit of Christ in Isaiah, foreseeing the sufferings of the Messiah as though they were already present, employs that tense in depicting them. Mr. Stern may well hesitate to say to whom the language appears. He cannot say definitely.

MR. STERN: I can.

MR. ROBERTS: But he has told us something on the subject upon which I shall be able to destroy him — in an amicable sense, of course. He tells us that the chapter applies to some one who had appeared before the days of Isaiah; and it does not apply to the Messiah, for the Messiah, according to Mr. Stern, has not yet made his appearance; and when he appears, will not be a sufferer. In saying this, Mr. Stern makes himself wiser than the Rabbis of his own nation.

MR. STERN: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: Even those Rabbis that agree with him in rejecting Jesus. I shall quote the opinions of several Rabbis — unbelievers in Jesus, but who contend, or at all events admit, that the 53rd of Isaiah does apply to the Messiah, although I dare say it will be difficult to find a Rabbi of that kind nowadays; for the exigencies of this controversy forced them to put a false construction upon it — a construction very different from that accepted by the Jews when the claims of Jesus of Nazareth had not to be encountered. I first read you a quotation that has been made from the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, a rabbi said to have lived contemporary with Christ, or about 30 or 40 years before his days, and, therefore, before the present controversy had arisen. In his commentary upon the 52nd and 53rd of Isaiah, he says:—

“Behold my servant, *the Messiah*, shall prosper; he shall rise and shall increase, and shall be exceedingly powerful, inasmuch as *the house of Israel have expected him many days*, during which their look and their splendour were eclipsed among the nations above those of other men. So shall he disperse many nations. Kings because of him shall be dumb; they shall lay their hands on their mouths, for what had not been related to them they shall behold, and what had not been heard of by them, they shall contemplate. Who hath credited this our news (Isaiah 53), and on whom is the mighty arm of Yahweh now displayed? The righteous man shall grow before him like the young twigs that are in the act of budding, and like the tree which spreads forth its roots by the running stream, so shall the generation of the righteous increase in the land that had lacked. His appearance is no ordinary appearance, nor is his terror that of a common man, but his splendour will be a sacred splendour, so that everyone that seeth him shall gaze on him. For this reason, he will be condemned, but he shall cause to arise the glory of all kingdoms: they shall be weak and sickly, just as a man of sorrows and inured to misfortune, or as when the presence of the habitation being withdrawn from us, we are despised and nothing accounted of, so shall it be to them. Therefore *he* will entreat for our sins, and our iniquities on *his* account shall be forgiven us. *He* is delivered up by our iniquities, but by his doctrine, peace will increase among us . . . It is the pleasure of Yahweh, on his behalf, to remit us all our sins. He entreats, and is heard; and before *he* opens his mouth, he is accepted.”

This quotation shows that Jonathan Ben Uzziel, 1,800 years ago, applied the 53rd chapter of Isaiah to the Messiah. Mr. Stern finds it inconvenient to admit this application. He says it does not apply to the Messiah at all, but to some one living before the days of Isaiah. Therefore he considers himself wiser than Jonathan Ben Uzziel and Zohar, who make the same applications as Ben Uzziel; wiser also than Solomon Ben Isaac. Jarki, another rabbi, who, writing in the 12th century, says:—

“King Messiah was among the generation of the wicked, and he applied his heart to seek mercy for Judah, and to fast and to humble himself on their behalf, as it is said. ‘And he was wounded for our transgressions’, and he seeks mercy for them when they sin, as it is written, ‘And by his stripes we are healed; and he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.’ ”.

Even of Aben Ezra we are told that he admits that Jonathan Ben Uzziel and many other Jews of old, applied it to a personal Messiah. In his commentary on Isaiah 53, he says, “Jonathan Ben Uzziel has interpreted it of the Messiah who is to come, and *this is also the opinion of* wise men of blessed memory, in many of their Medrashes”.

I have several other illustrations of a similar treatment of the chapter by the Jews in ancient times, but I will content myself with reading the comprehensive declaration of Rabbi Moses Alschech, who lived in the fifteenth century, and who also applied it to the Messiah. He says: “*Our Rabbis, with one mouth have reverently received by tradition that King Messiah is here spoken of*”. I have got all the ancient Rabbis on my side against a single Jew of the nineteenth century.

(Mr. Stern: Hear, hear).

MR. ROBERTS: Then Mr. Stern’s comments on the experience of Jesus — I certainly think it unnecessary to notice these particularly. I might also use another adjective; it would be almost a condescension to reply to them. I would only say that the relation of sorrow to a man depends upon what he is. That which is sorrow to one man is not sorrow to another. Go quite low enough for illustration, and you find a creature in a well-known enclosure to be found at the back of many cottages, whose head you could not cause to ache by telling it of a bank failure: the mere mention of which would fill a commercial man with panic and drive sleep from the pillow, and perhaps drive him to suicide. The only way of making the porcine creature sorry would be to whip it on the back. You might shout bad news over a pig’s head for a year and produce no effect. (Uproar among the Jews.) There is nothing insulting in my remark. It all depends upon the mental quality of the man, as to what will make sad. Take a man of low type of mentality, and you could not injure his feelings by language which stings to the quick a man of higher organization. And if this holds good with regard to the lower manifestations of mentality, how much more strictly does it apply to the highest faculty of the human mind. A philanthropist’s heart is pained in going through the streets

of Birmingham, where a mere clod-hopper feels nothing, because the former stands on a pinnacle of moral elevation which the latter has no conception of; and if Mr. Stern fails to see that Jesus was a man of sorrows with abundant reason, it is impossible for me to make him see it. It reminds me of the uselessness of attempting to enlighten Israel; for their own prophet Moses said, "Ye are a stiff-necked and rebellious race with heart fat, ears dull of hearing, and eyes closed." Their entire history has been a history of rebellion. They rebelled against Moses in the wilderness; they rebelled against all the prophets and turned aside to idolatry continually, and they are now scattered among the Gentiles, in consequence of their almost incurable tendency to go astray from the God of their fathers. Mr. Stern's attitude in this matter is only another illustration of the same thing. (Time called.)

THE CHAIRMAN, in reference to the wish of Mr. Stern that he should decide as to whether Mr. Roberts had adhered to the question or not, said that before the debate commenced, he had a clear understanding that he should not undertake anything of the kind. He thought that had just been the mischief at other debates.

MR. STERN: I suppose it is now a fight between myself and my friend, and fight it I shall. I have tried to conduct the discussion in a most amicable and gentlemanly manner. I have controlled myself as much as I possibly could. I know he is trying to irritate me. (Hisses.) It is no use hissing me. I have told you, and I tell you again, that hissing will have no effect upon me. We are discussing a very serious subject. Mr. Roberts seems to be trying to drag me into a discussion of Judaism *versus* Christianity. I hold he is out of order to quote disputed writings, when I keep telling him to produce the authority. He says I spoke irreverently of Jesus. If I did I am sorry for it. If I said anything to wound your feelings; if I spoke irreverently, I certainly am sorry, but how can I help it? My friend is looking upon Jesus as the Son of God; I am looking upon him as a man and an imposter. This is my duty here to-night, and however painful, I must do it, and will do it. For the sixth time, I beg of Mr. Roberts — or else I will throw the discussion up — I ask him to show me his authority for the writings of the New Testament. He forgets that he has come here in opposition to greater men who have gone before him, and that he lays down a doctrine in opposition to the generality of Christians. But look how liberal he is to me. He won't allow me to have an opinion. He says I am in opposition to all the Jewish writers. The question is not whom I am in opposition to; I came here to debate the question whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or not. My only duty is to prove that he is not. How can I prove that he is not before he proves that he is? The quotations he has brought have nothing to do with the subject; the passages in Isaiah have nothing at all to do with Jesus. Then what does he do? Instead of answering what I begged of him to do, he goes forward and shows me another quotation, which has nothing at all to do with the question. He says, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is

risen upon thee.” Of course, the glory of the Lord had risen when they had got an Isaiah to speak to. What argument is this? But I will take it from whom it comes. My friends of the Jewish persuasion have been offended because he has mentioned a pig. They must not be offended, for, being a Christian, he must introduce the pig in some way or other. Mr. Roberts seems to be trying to drag me into a discussion of Judaism *versus* Christianity, but I do not intend to enter into that to-night. Again, he brings Hebrew authorities who seem to have written in his favour. To show that he has dived deep into the subject, it is sufficient to notice that he has produced the testimony of rabbis living at the time of Christ; because we know certainly that none but learned men could pretend to know anything about that. But he does all this, I hold, for the purpose of evading the question at issue. As soon as he showed me a passage last night in Isaiah, which he said referred to Jesus, that is a virgin conceiving and bearing a son, I did my best to give my version of what it meant, and if I proved my case his whole argument falls to the ground. The next argument was about Daniel. I cannot understand a person saying one thing and meaning another. I can only take it from what I hear. But Mr. Roberts says that the subject Daniel spoke about then was not a subject for everyone to understand, and that he spoke in an allegorical way. Well, he did speak in a curious way, but after all, it was only a dream and, surely to goodness, we are not to rest such important things on what people see in visions and dreams. There is no accounting for what a man sees in a dream. We dream so many strange things. Then he brings in things that have nothing to do with the matter. I remember hearing a conversation between my father, who was a very good Jew, and several learned men, in which an opinion was expressed that Daniel was mad, and I am inclined to look on him in the same light. I don’t care who hears me. Supposing, however, we granted, for the sake of argument, that every day meant one year. Let us see whether Mr. Roberts’ case would hold good even then. Since my friend takes upon him, in 1871, perhaps 2,000 years after the words were spoken, to tell us that these people didn’t mean what they said; that when God said seventy weeks he meant seventy times seven years; let us see how it will apply in other places? Jesus was to be three days and three nights in the ground — that was three years. I have as much right to assume that in this case as he has in the other. I stand here as an authority in opposition to an authority like Mr. Roberts. I give him credit for his superior learning, but I don’t see superior logic on his side. He comes here telling us, like the stupid missionaries — (The Chairman objected to the words.) Well; I beg pardon. With your permission, I will withdraw the word. He comes here like the intelligent missionaries (great laughter and applause); like these intelligent missionaries, he comes forward and taunts me with being blind, not being able to see. Why, my good sir (turning to Mr. Roberts), why should you be so personal to me? I have tried to be as gentle as possible. Why should you taunt me with wilfully misrepresenting? Why should you taunt me with not seeing it, when we can see other things well enough. We can see precious stones (loud laughter). The Jews are clever enough judges of the minutest

things, and why should they be blind on this subject? We are the best judges of jewels — diamonds, emeralds, and the best stones — and you will acknowledge that it takes good sight to be that. Surely, we can see such a bit of an argument as a virgin conceiving without a man, or anything of that sort. Then there have been men, as recorded in the Old Testament, who have lived something like 800 or 900 years. But as every day of those years, according to Mr. Roberts, must mean a year, those people are alive now, and if Mr. Roberts can tell us where they are to be found, I shall be obliged to him. If it means years in Daniel, in must mean years in other places. When Moses said, “Six days shalt thou work, and do all that thou hast to do”, he meant they should labour six years continuously, and make as much overtime as they pleased. If I had known that this would have been the subject of discussion, I am sure I would not have undertaken it. If I had known that questions would arise like this, I should have been sorry to come here, wasting my time and yours. I have come here to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah. How can I approach the subject when Mr. Roberts will not deal with it? I again ask him to answer these questions which I have put to him, and it will give me a chance of proceeding. I intend, if I have time, to go through Dan. 9, and show that it is impossible to reconcile the weeks and years. The Chairman informs me I have but one minute, so I ask you, Mr. Roberts, to tell me who wrote St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John? When were they written? In what language? At what place? and by whom? (Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS: I say, respected friends, in answer to that, that Matthew was written by Matthew in the Hebrew language, and afterwards translated into Greek; Mark was written by Mark at the dictation of Peter, as is supposed; Luke was written by Luke; John was written by John; the three last all in Greek. They were all written for the information of believers in Christ, and as an authentic and official record (for the information of subsequent generations) of the facts upon which their faith was based. I am not able to produce the originals, because, as I believe, they do not exist. If Mr. Stern asks me why, I give this answer: I say for precisely the same reason that he would tell me who wrote the five books of Moses, the books of Samuel and the others. Why would he say so? for a very good reason. If the authorship of a book is unquestioned at the moment of its production, and continues in all subsequent generations to be received, the fact amounts to a demonstration. To pursue this thought would lead me to diverge from the subject, and I will only say that commonsense at once recognises the reasonableness of the principle. We can only know of the authorship of a book, produced at a time antecedent to our own, by the repute existing amongst those who from their position were competent to judge. Upon this principle, Mr. Stern accepts the writings of Moses; upon the same principle, the classical public accepts the writings of Shakespeare; the writings of Herodotus, and the Greek authors generally; and on the same principle we

accept the other writings of his own nation, which he rejects, namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. If he urges it as a difficulty that I cannot produce the very documents written by these men, he behaves unreasonably, because he puts himself in precisely the same difficulty with Moses.

MR. STERN: What has that to do with it?

MR. ROBERTS: A great deal.

MR. STERN: No.

MR. ROBERTS: I will show that it has. Mr. Stern believes in Moses and yet he cannot produce the originals.

MR. STERN: I can.

MR. ROBERTS: I say that statement is not true.

MR. STERN: It is.

MR. ROBERTS: Then I call upon him to produce them.

MR. STERN: I shall produce them.

THE CHAIRMAN: This conversation is out of order. I beg of each speaker not to utter a single word whilst the other is speaking.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Stern puts himself up as an authority, and says he pits his authority against mine. There is no need for this. I am not an authority at all. I do not pretend to have the slightest scintilla of authority. I am here as a perfectly unofficial individual dealing with historical facts, and these are the authorities with me. It is with these I ask Mr. Stern to deal. Mr. Stern thinks Daniel was mad. (Mr. Stern: Hear, hear.) Then observe the position in which he puts himself, viz., against God. His God considers Daniel wise. In Ezek. 14:14, it says, "Though these wise men, Noah, *Daniel*, and Job were in the land, they should but deliver their own souls by their righteousness." Again, in the 28th of Ezekiel, speaking of the King of Tyre, at the 3rd verse, God says, "Behold thou art *wiser than Daniel*; there is no secret that they can hide from thee", an ironical saying, but still showing Daniel as a standard of wisdom. From these two testimonies alone (even apart from the book of Daniel), we observe the fact that God considered Daniel wise and righteous, whereas Mr. Stern, adopting the theory of his father, considers him mad. Why? Because it is the only way of getting rid of Daniel's prophecy which tells so powerfully in favour of Jesus of Nazareth. He asks why didn't Daniel speak plainly, and say what he meant? There is a reason. God intended the book of Daniel for a very wide bearing and providential purpose; it was to let those know to whom it should be given that the purposes of God at last concerning Israel was, that they should triumph at the last, but should first be prevailed against. At the same time it was not His will that His people of these early times should know that the triumph of the enemy would be so long. He therefore veiled the matter, and gave revelation in such a form that they were not

able to perceive the time. But why then give the time at all, it may be asked. Because it was necessary that when the end of time should be reached, a people should be able to perceive the scope of the divine purpose — a people who, seeing this, should be looking for the coming of the Messiah, and prepared as intelligent spectators for the development of the divine purpose. So that there is a reason, and it is impossible to upset that reason if the authenticity of the book of Daniel be accepted; for in that book we are told both that Daniel did not understand (Dan. 12:8), but that at the time of the end the vision should be understood (Dan. 12:4).

Then Mr. Stern asks how the statement of Isaiah can be applied to Jesus, whose genealogy I have attempted to produce, if he was cut off? and seeing that the same individual who was cut off was to have a generation succeeding him — was to see “his seed”. Mr. Stern asks how could he have “seed”, seeing he never was married? I answer there are more methods of generating seed in the divine operations than are known to Mr. Stern’s philosophy, as John the Baptist said, “Of the very stones God could raise children to Abraham”. I point to the operations of the gospel as the answer; and when Mr. Stern says I am calling upon him to accept records which he does not believe, I entirely repudiate that representation of the matter. I am not dealing with documents only. I am dealing with historical facts, facts whose evidence is before himself. We have a Christianity apart from the book; that Christianity has a history, and I ask him is it not an historical fact that Christianity came out from Jerusalem through Jews? He cannot deny it. Those Jews preached among the Gentiles for the express purpose of generating believers in Jesus; their word was a seed from which believers sprung, and the existence of those believers explain how it is that Christ can have a seed in a higher sense than Mr. Stern recognises, for what is their doctrine? “As many of you”, says Paul, writing to the Christians, “as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ, *and if ye be Christ’s*, then are ye *Abraham’s seed*, and heirs according to the promise”. So that here is a seed developed from Christ in relation to Abraham, in connection with the promise of which Abraham was made the depository. I need say no more to explain how the Messiah, though cut off, could have a seed. I will simply ask Mr. Stern how his system explains it? I presume he will say that he is not bound to give an explanation, and he must take the consequence of adopting that policy so far as the impression on the audience is concerned. It is a very suspicious fact when a disputant refuses to explain facts alleged to be inconsistent with his own theory.

I now resume the line of evidence I was pursuing. I was illustrating the fact that the Messiah, according to the prophets of Mr. Stern’s own nation, was to be a sufferer. He says that Isaiah himself was the great light of Israel. Well, now observe that this great light was sent to say (Isaiah 6:9), “Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not, and see indeed, but perceive not”. What is the meaning of this? Does it not show that the Jews lack understanding? For as Mr. Stern says, they can discern jewels and diamonds, but higher things are hid from them in our time. “Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears

heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and be converted and be healed”. According to Mr. Stern’s interpretation, the great light of his nation was sent to bring darkness! What a desperate strait Mr. Stern must be in when he finds himself compelled to sustain his theory by such injustice to his own Scriptures. I referred to the 53rd chapter of Isaiah as showing that the Messiah was to be a personage at first rejected. I now refer to Psa. 118:22 for the same purpose, “The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner”. The builders of Israel were to reject their chief corner stone; will they deny that the chief corner stone of their political edifice is the Messiah? Then he was to be rejected by the builders. Is the Messiah of Mr. Stern’s expectation to be rejected? Jesus of Nazareth was rejected by the head men of Israel, and therefore he answers to this prophetic intimation of David. I next refer to Isaiah 8:14.

“He shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and shall be broken, and be snared, and be taken. Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. And I will wait upon the Lord, that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him”.

Who has been the stone of stumbling to Israel? Jesus of Nazareth. And God has hidden His face from them; for are they not now broken and snared and taken? Have they not been for 1,800 years wandering in darkness? Jesus of Nazareth has ascended into Heaven, and by the testimony of the Apostles, is sitting at the right hand of God; and the binding of the law and the sealing of the testimony among his disciples is now going on. How complete is the correspondence between Jesus and the Messiah foretold by the prophets. (Time called.)

MR. STERN: My opponent thinks that he has a perfect right, and that he is perfectly in order, to go on asking me to produce the originals of Moses. I hold that he is out of order to answer my question by asking me another. I have not come to discuss Judaism *versus* Christadelphianism. I shall produce the originals of Moses when we discuss that subject. It is not my purpose here to-night. It is for you (looking at Mr. Roberts) to produce yours; it is for you to affirm that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah and for me to deny. Now we have got so far from Mr. Roberts; after a great deal of trouble I have got him to acknowledge that Matthew was written by Matthew, Mark by Mark, Luke by Luke, and John by John, consequently I shall deal with that matter as soon as I am at liberty; but I shall now proceed with what I intended to do in my last speech. My friend says that I have no right to assume that Daniel was mad. Perhaps it is a very grave assumption on my part to say so. I only say this that if he was the prophet of God, and if he spoke the words of God, of course he was not mad at that time; but it is possible when he said those words about the little horns and the big horns and

what he saw in the vision — it is quite possible that if he was not mad, he was not very sensible. At least so far as I am concerned, it has nothing whatever to do with the subject to-night. The only issue is whether we shall take the weeks in Daniel to represent weeks of years, and in other places as weeks of days. My friend has not attempted to deal with that. I have laid great stress upon what a queer thing it would be if Jesus were in the grave three years instead of three days. I have shown that, according to my friend's argument, some people referred to in the Old Testament must have lived for thousands of years. Perhaps Livingstone has met with some of them in his travels; that is to say if I assume that each week of the years they lived represents seven years. I am now going to Daniel 9. In verse 25 it says that Messiah the Prince will appear at the end of the seventh week, before the re-building of Jerusalem. Now this cannot be this Jesus, as he was not born until 350 years after the re-building of Jerusalem, and only seventy years before it was again destroyed. Besides in the next verse it is said that after three score and two weeks the Messiah shall be cut off. Calling the weeks seven years in this case as in the other, the true Messiah ought to have lived 434 years. Did Christ live so long? He died, it has been said, when thirty-two or thirty-three years old; thus leaving a slight deficiency of upwards of 400 years. Again, from the context it appears that the Messiah was to be a temporal prince. Daniel calls him Messiah the Prince, and talks of troublesome times and of building streets and walls. Was Jesus such a Messiah? We are told in verse 27 that he was to confirm the covenant with many for one week. Did Jesus confirm a covenant with anyone for one week — namely, seven years? His ministry lasted about three. In the midst of the week, we are also told he was to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. Did Christ do this in his time? The Messiah was to be cut off after three score and two weeks, at the same time that the city and the sanctuary were destroyed. Now Jesus was put to death thirty-seven years before the destruction of the city, and not at the same time. It is further announced that these seventy weeks were to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins. Was this result attained either during the seventy weeks or after their expiration? Why as Jews we do not to-day profess to be without sin. So far from these seventy weeks or 490 years, agreeing so precisely with the advent of Christ, there was a difference of at least half-a-century. In every particular therefore, is this boasted prophecy of Mr. Roberts falsified. I will now — since my friend insists upon the genuineness, and since he rests his whole life upon the New Testament — I will now proceed to quote a few passages, and see how these men who were inspired by God, relate circumstances, whether they knew them or not — agree with each other. I will endeavour to show you how they agree with one another. In the first place I refer to St. Luke, and he gives us a description of the resurrection. He says "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre bringing spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them". Now this inspired writer cannot even tell you who "they" were. He simply says "they" came "and certain others with them"; I do not know who they were. But when I come to St. John he seems to be a little more

informed on the subject, and it is very kind of him that he really condescends to mention it. St. John says, "the first day of the week came Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, to the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre". Now although Luke is deficient in instruction, John makes up for it. Why Mary was so anxious to go on Saturday night, or as he terms it on Sunday morning, I do not know. They could not have expected anything which they afterwards saw, for they seemed all astonished at what they did see. What her object was in coming we are not told; but let us suppose that she did know. Some ladies know things even better than gentlemen. Supposing Mary did know the things which the apostles did not. The grand inspired apostles, the beautiful apostles, which my friend objects to me speaking so disparagingly of — the grand apostles did not know as much as the woman. What did she know? She knew that Jesus was to rise on the third day, for he was to be like Jonah who was in the whale's belly for three days and three nights. Jesus was to be three days and three nights in the grave. As Jesus was crucified on Friday, and buried on the same evening; how comes it that she was so very anxious to know whether he had risen when he had only been buried thirty hours? I shall leave it to Mr. Roberts, who knows what people not only said but thought at the time — if he will be kind enough to tell us. (Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS: I can tell Mr. Stern that Mary did not go to the sepulchre with the expectation that Jesus should rise. On the contrary, in common with the disciples, she "knew not the Scriptures that he should rise from the dead". She went to the grave to perform the last offices of the dead, to anoint the body with certain spices. Mr. Stern is therefore arguing on a fallacy, when he assumes Mary was at the grave in expectation of His resurrection. Then the apostles were not inspired at that time; they were not inspired till the Day of Pentecost; we are distinctly informed (Jno. 7:39) that the Holy Spirit was not given when Christ was with them. The argument on that point therefore also falls to the ground. As to the alleged discrepancies between the accounts of the resurrection, he has yet to make them manifest. What is there inconsistent between the two narratives although they vary? I see nothing, and until he shows they conflict, I need not attempt to reconcile them. Then because he finds the prophecy of the seventy weeks very much in his way, he makes another attempt to get rid of it. But just as he assumed facts about the resurrection which had no existence, so he does in this case. He says that the Messiah should have appeared at the end of the seventh week after the re-building of Jerusalem. He does not perceive that the whole period from the re-building of Jerusalem to the Messiah, is seventy weeks, and that the seven weeks is only a subdivision marked by certain events in Jewish history. Mr. Stern on this point is raising fictitious objections. I may tell you in brief that just as in the application of the 53rd of Isaiah, so in this, he is at issue with the great bulk of his ancestors, who recognised the seventy weeks as the prophetic equivalent of 490 years, at the end of which they expected the Messiah. He asks why should they

look at the matter thus; the reason is obvious. Fitness demands, that where in a vision great things are represented by little things, such as a dynasty by a little horn, an empire by a beast, and so on, so a great period of time should be represented by a small period of time; and if he asks for Scriptural authority for the view that the scale is a day for a year, he has only to refer to the 4th chapter of Ezekiel, 4th and 5th verses, where a period of time is distinctly explained to have been symbolised on the day for a year principle. The period of seventy weeks is subdivided with regard to certain events that were to mark the currency. After three score and two weeks (in the 25th verse), from the issue of the command for the restoration of Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince, were to be seven weeks, at the end of which Jerusalem would be fully re-established, though the time would be troublous; three score and two weeks, at the end of which the ministry of the Messiah would commence. But Mr. Stern says that according to Daniel, the Messiah was to appear at the end of the seven. This is not so; and as Mr. Stern has failed to show it, it is sufficient for me to contradict it. It is after the threescore and the seven that the Messiah was to appear, and Jesus appeared at that very time John had fulfilled his mission in preparing a situation favourable for the Lord's introduction to the notice of Israel. Three and a half of the last seven years had run, and then Jesus himself was revealed to Israel; and in the second half of the last seven, he did confirm the covenant made to the fathers. I give Mr. Stern a Jew's authority for that. Paul, in Rom. 15:8, says, "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, *to confirm the promises made unto the fathers*". Jesus confirmed those covenants of promise by removing the great impediment in the way of their fulfilment. He was cut off, and thus made reconciliation for iniquity and brought in everlasting righteousness, without which it was impossible that the bestowal of immortality involved in the covenant could have been made for Abraham was under the sentence of Eden. Until the obstacle arising out of that was removed, it was impossible that the covenant could be carried out. The matter before us is the solution of the difficulty. Jesus of Nazareth, the seed of Abraham and David, yet a spotless, sinless victim, died, crucified, and thus took away the sin of the world, and in rising again confirmed the covenant made with the fathers. This was in the last half of the week. He also caused to cease the Mosaic sacrifices, for Paul, who was a Jew of higher standing than Mr. Stern (for, as he said, "I am a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee, a Hebrew of the Hebrews") says Jesus put an end to the law of Moses, nailing it to his cross. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth (Rom. 10:4). He says, "The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, but by one offering he, the Messiah, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. He taketh away the first covenant (Mosaic) that he may establish the second" (Abrahamic) (Heb. 10:9). So that as regards their efficacy — their divine validity — Jesus of Nazareth did cause, in his death, a cessation of sacrifices as intimated in the prophecy of the seventy weeks. It is vain for anyone to point to the fact that they continued to be offered in the temple, for though offered they were no longer recognised.

I will now resume my line of evidence. In Zech. 12:10, speaking of the time of coming glory, it says:—

“And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplications; and *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.”

To whom does this apply? Does Mr. Stern expect his Messiah to be pierced by the Jews? No, but Jesus of Nazareth was pierced by the Jews. Mr. Stern may say the Romans. No doubt the actual wounding was by them, but at whose instigation was it? When a man takes an implement in his hand and does something with it, you do not say it is the implement that does it; the thing done is the act of the operator, though actually done by the implement. In this way the Queen is said to do things in the government of the country that she in reality does not do, because they are considered to be done by her authority. On the same principle, the Jews did pierce the Messiah by means of the Romans. The Romans of their own accord would never have done it. Pilate wanted to let him go, but the Jews clamoured for his crucifixion, and so Pilate gave them their way. Here then is a statement that they are to look upon him whom they have pierced. Does not this answer to Jesus of Nazareth?

I refer next to Zech. 9:9, where this same king is introduced:—

“Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout O daughter of Jerusalem, behold thy King cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly riding upon an ass and upon a colt the foal of an ass”.

And it goes on to say at the eleventh verse, “As for thee also, by *the blood of thy covenant*, I have sent forth thy priests out of the pit wherein is no water” (a metaphorical description of the grave peculiar to the prophets). Now here is an intimation that there is to be in connection with the Messiah, a liberation of the people from the grave, as the result of a covenant to which blood has relation. “The blood of thy covenant”. Can Mr. Stern explain this connection with his Messiah? Can he deny its applicability to Jesus of Nazareth? The blood of Jesus Christ was shed on Calvary, and in all New Testament representations of the final triumph of Christ’s work, his blood is a prominent feature. “He hath washed us *in his own blood*” (Rev. 1:5). “Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation” (Rev. 5:9). Mr. Stern asks how Jesus justifies anybody? I answer by quoting Paul in Acts 13:38. In the course of a speech addressed to the Jews, Paul says, “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you *the forgiveness of sins*; and by him all that believe are *justified from all things* from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses”. My answer then is, that Israel’s God is pleased to regard a man as in a righteous position who has faith in this crucified Messiah.

In Isaiah 49:7, you have the same idea distinctly brought to view:—

“Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy one of Israel, and he shall choose thee. Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and *give thee for a covenant for the people*, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages”.

Now what is a covenant? According to the Hebrew term, it is a dividing by cutting, because a covenant was established over the divided bodies of slain beasts; so that in saying of this personage that God would give him for a covenant, it was equivalent to saying that he would give him up to be done as was done to Jesus of Nazareth; as the result of which, great blessings would flow to those who believed in him. Will this apply to Mr. Stern's looked-for Messiah? It applies to Jesus. Carrying out this view, we find in the next chapter (Isaiah 50:5), “I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting”, which is true of Jesus of Nazareth: to him these words most truly apply. Again, in Micah 5:1, you have the same feature:

“Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops; he hath laid siege against us; *they shall smite the judge of Israel* with a rod upon the cheek”.

The judge of Israel is the Messiah. Has the Messiah whom Mr. Stern expects, to be smitten? (Looking at Mr. Stern). He shakes his head; therefore his Messiah is not the Messiah of the prophets, for the Messiah of the prophets was to be smitten to death, and buried with the rich. (Time called.)

MR. STERN: You have heard the last sentence of Mr. Roberts; I am very sorry to say that I do not approve the style or the manner he debates this question. Really and truly if you have taken notice of him, you must have been impressed as I have been. It must have seemed to you, as if the Jews are here before you, accused to-day of crucifying Jesus, and you are the jury to judge, and he is the counsel pleading for Jesus; and he wishes you to condemn us to-day. Really, I did not think I was coming here for that; surely he might have put it in a milder manner than he has done. Do speak in a calmer tone! What do you mean by saying we have crucified your Jesus? How dare you come here and say we have crucified your Jesus? According to your theory, he has no right to be crucified; according to your theory, Jesus is wrongly crucified; we are to be blamed for crucifying him. And what would become of your salvation then? You would all have to go to hell. We ought to argue this question calmly. I have tried to argue it calmly. I have no ill-feeling against any man or women, no matter where they come from; whatever creed they belong to. As Christians, I hate you, but outside of your Christianity, I can love, and respect you as men. I do not blame you, nor give you a wrong sentiment as individuals, I give my hatred to that blasphemous, infamous and

merciless creed which you call Christianity. (Disapprobation.) My friends I have told you over and over again, that hissing will have no effect on me. Not one sentence will I leave out. Well, my friend speaks as if life itself depended upon it.

MR. ROBERTS: It does.

MR. STERN: It does in your opinion. If I was to be judged, I would at least get impartial people to judge me. I have told you over and over again, that I have not come here to discuss Judaism. We have got another night, and I hope and trust that he will use milder language, so that I may be able to reply in the same terms. I told him at the outset, "do not be surprised, if the result of this discussion is for me to embrace Christianity". Is this the way to get me to be a Christian? At least you ought to use mild language. Let us see some of your Christian kindness. We are not here as Jews who have crucified Jesus: I hold that they did not crucify him. The Jews were under the Roman government, and they had no power to withhold him from being crucified. It is your forged documents that tell you we have crucified him. We have never done anything of the sort. In fact, before I leave here, I am prepared to prove that Jesus was not crucified at all. (Laughter.) According to Mr. Roberts, everything I say falls to the ground, and everything he says is established. He says, Jesus did fulfil the covenant. I will refer you to Dan. 10:27 — "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week". Christ did not confirm the covenant for one week, that is, seven years. The whole of his ministry did not last above three. How can it refer to Jesus. He says that although they have continued to sacrifice, they are not recognised by God. This is the height of presumption, for a man to come here in 1871, and tell us what God did 2,000 years ago. How dare you come here and say so? The very fact that they continued the sacrifices showed that God must have accepted them. How dare you come here and say He did not? Surely my friend does not mean to say that he has dreamed, and that a ghost has appeared to him. I do not believe in ghosts; but perhaps he will make a distinction between an ordinary ghost and a holy one. If he does I shall be glad to know the difference. Of course my friend says he has cut me to pieces with everything he has said. I will leave it to you whether he has or not. He says that Mary Magdalene went with some spices to embalm Jesus. Well now, it says, "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth and cometh to Simon Peter". She ran away, so you see she did not do what she went for. But mark this, although Luke says, "They came, and certain others with them", which means a few, say half-a-dozen, John says it was only Mary Magdalene; and Mark says "when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him". It says there were two Marys. This is certainly a little more sensible, still it would not agree with Luke; it must be more than three; it certainly contradicts. In John it says that on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene, "then she runneth". It is alluding to one person, because if any

more were there they would all run. Now let us see what Matthew says: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre; and, behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it". Here is an earthquake which everybody should have noticed, and yet none of the apostles say anything about it but Matthew. My friend says they were not inspired then, and that they were liable to error; and I admit it. I wish to make one or two remarks before the close of the meeting. I am perfectly willing to receive any fair argument, any reasonable one, but not a mysterious one. The whole of last night he was referring to the beautiful mysteries of the New Testament. I intended to ask him what he meant. I do not blame him for referring to the mysterious, but I want people to explain mysteries. I have not come here to get you to embrace Judaism. If he tries to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, I shall prove that he was not. The decision rests with you. I will conclude in the words of the poet, John Critchley Prince:

"My religion is love—'tis the noblest and purest;
 My temple the universe—widest and surest;
 I worship my God through His works which are fair,
 And the joy of my thoughts is perpetual prayer."

THIRD NIGHT,

Thursday, October 19th, 1871.

THE meeting having been opened *pro forma* by the Chairman,

MR. ROBERTS said: Ladies and Gentlemen, when Mr. Stern gave me the challenge which has led to this debate, it was with the idea, on his part, of holding but one meeting. I told him at once that I felt sure that we should not be able to go through the subject in one night — that it would want, at least, three nights. I am afraid that I was under the mark. The extent of the evidence that I proposed to adduce in support of the claims that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, I find to be so great as to make it next to impossible to compress it within the designed limits. For this reason, I must necessarily pass by many points of detail which I had thought of noticing, and content myself with following that line of positive evidence which is likely to make an impression upon logical and sincere minds, with regard to the merits of the question. There are, however, one or two little matters I should like to say a word upon before pursuing this course. I should like to say that Mr. Stern has rather misapprehended my appeal last night to the general attitude of his people in the course of their history. He resented my appeal as an accusation. He thinks that I appeared in the capacity of an accusing counsel, calling upon you to pass judgment upon them. I excuse him for making that mistake, seeing that there

are so many plain things which he has failed to perceive with that clearness which one would have expected: but I will give the explanation. The argument I intended in my appeal was a mere answer to an argument employed by himself. He said: "My fathers rejected the Messiah; therefore, I will", which implies this assumption: "My fathers were in the right in their rejecting Jesus". Now, my answer strikes at the root of this assumption. It shows that his fathers (according to what he himself is compelled to admit) have always been in the wrong, and, therefore, that is highly probable that upon this greater question, they are equally in the wrong. I should like to deal with the great Jewish objections to the genealogies of Christ as found in the New Testament. I expected to be called upon at the hands of Mr. Stern to deal with these objections, and, therefore, reserved in my first half-hour speech, the more particular consideration of them. He has not so called upon me. Yet as the point is of some importance, I will devote a minute or two to the subject before passing on to the general evidence in demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus. The Jewish objection to the genealogies is, that even if they were genuine, they would fail to prove Jesus to be of the seed of David, since they do not make him out to have been so on the male side — the female side not reckoning in Jewish genealogies. I admit that so far as the strict genealogical tree is concerned, the female genealogy is not taken into account, but I do deny that the Jewish genealogies ignored the female element in reckoning extraction. I will call your attention to one or two proofs in support of my denial in the writings of the Old Testament — in the writings of Mr. Stern's own nation, and which he is bound to recognize. In the cases to which I call attention, the interposition of a female was sufficient to continue a genealogical line in the absence of a male link; men were reckoned the sons of fathers whose real sons they were not, by reason of their marrying the father's daughter. I refer first to 1 Chronicles 2:22, in which we learn that one Jair was begotten of Segub, son of Hezron, son of Phares, son of Judah, one of the sons of Jacob. The words of the verse are "Hezron went in to the daughter of Machir, the father of Gilead, whom he married when he was threescore years old: and she bare him Segub, and Segub begat Jair". Now, according to the argument of the Jews upon the genealogy of Jesus, Jair ought to be reckoned of the house of Judah, because he was the son of Hezron of the tribe of Judah, though his mother was the daughter of Machir of the tribe of *Manasseh*. The mother ought not to be allowed, according to their argument, to have any effect in determining the genealogical status of the son. But we find that contrary to the Jewish contention the mother did have effect. When we turn to Numb. 32:41, we find this same individual (Jair) introduced as "the son of Manasseh", because he was the son of a daughter of the tribe of Manasseh, though his father was of the tribe of Judah. Now I ask upon what principle can it be denied that Jesus was the son of David, when his mother was of the house of David, if Jair was a son of Manasseh, because his mother was of the house of Manasseh?

Again, in the same chapter we read of Sheshan, of whom we are told, in the 34th verse, that "*he had no sons, BUT DAUGHTERS*", according to which Sheshan

(in the Jewish contention), should have had no subsequent genealogy. But what happens? At the same 34th verse, it says that Sheshan had a servant, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha; and *Sheshan gave his daughter to Jarha to wife*, and she bare him Attai, and Attai begat Nathan, &c. Now, whose children were Attai, Nathan, &c., according to Jewish objection to Jesus? Jarha's distinctly. Not Sheshan's, the father of Jarha's wife. Yet at the 31st verse, they are called *the children of Sheshan*. True, it reads "Ahlai" instead of Attai, but this is one of those mere variations which are so common in Hebrew names. Thus, we find the offspring of Sheshan's daughter attributed to *the father of that daughter* and not to be reckoned at all to the Egyptian. Now, if Attai can be the son of Sheshan, according to the Jewish genealogy, when he is only the son of Sheshan's daughter, I ask why Jesus of Nazareth cannot be considered the son of David, though descended from David by a daughter only? Again, we have the case of Hiram, employed by Solomon in the artistic processes of the Temple. He is described as the son of *a woman of the daughters of Dan*. There are other cases which I had sought out, but these must suffice. I consider them sufficient upon that single point, which I supposed Mr. Stern would have made a strong point.

I now resume the line of evidence upon which I was engaged last evening, and to which, in view of the limited time, I shall strive largely to devote myself in the subsequent part of to-night's debate, irrespective of the course Mr. Stern may pursue; unless, indeed, he unexpectedly turn very logical, and give me something else to deal with. You will recollect that, last night, I produced an abundance of evidence from the prophets to show that the Messiah was to be a sufferer, and, at last slain. The passage I now quote was to have been the last link of evidence on that point. In Zech. 13:6, it says: "And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? then shall he answer: *Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends;*" in connection with which we have this singular declaration: "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and *against the man* my fellow, saith the LORD of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones". The first point here is that Messiah is described as the *fellow* of Yahweh, the God of Israel; I ask upon what principle the Messiah looked for by Mr. Stern can be described as the fellow of God? The New Testament Messiah answers that description exactly; for we are told, in the 1st chapter of Heb., verse 2, that he is "the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person". This result was by the very means that the Jews despise with so much scorn — the operation of the Spirit upon a virgin of the house of David. Thus was begotten a son of David and son of God — higher than the mere man Messiah of Jewish expectation. This reminds me that, last night, Mr. Stern made some sort of unfavourable comment upon an expression of mine about the beauty of the mystery. Now I did not attempt, as he supposed I did, to explain the mystery; for there are depths in divine truth that we can only know without being able to understand. And this is true in nature as well. We know the sunlight, but we do not understand it. We know life in all creatures, but we do not

understand it. There are thousands of things we know, but cannot understand in a profound sense, because the infinite is beyond the grasp of the human intellect. I do not attempt to define the mystery of God in Christ, but I pointed out what Mr. Stern failed to see — that Jesus of Nazareth combines the two necessities created by the prophets. The Messiah was to be the son of David; Jesus of Nazareth was so. He was to be God: Jesus of Nazareth was so in the sense of God being manifested in the flesh by the Spirit; whereas, the Messiah he upholds as a mere man, cannot be made to answer to these two things.

I proceed to call attention to other features of the Messiah of the prophets with which Jesus of Nazareth corresponds. In Deut. 18:18, we read: “I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put *my words in his mouth*: and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto *my words which he shall speak in my name*, I will require it of him”. The point here is the declaration “I will put my words in his mouth” — the words of the God of Israel in the mouth of the antitypical Moses. This feature is apparent in other parts of the prophets. In Isaiah 61:1, you find it in these words: “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound”. Again in Isaiah 11:2: “The Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD”. Again in Isaiah 51:16: “I have put *my words in thy mouth*, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand;” and again in Micah 5:4: “He shall stand and feed *in the strength of Yahweh*, in the majesty of the name of the LORD his God; and they shall abide, for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth”.

Now, Jesus of Nazareth answers to all these plain declarations concerning the Messiah, in the Old Testament. He did not pretend to be wise of himself. He expressly declared that God’s words were in his mouth; he did not, according to Trinitarian views of him, claim to be God himself — one of three persons in the God-head — but he claimed to be the manifestation of the one Eternal Father, who revealed Himself through him to Israel. I proceed to call your attention to the illustrations of this point. In John 3:34, we have the testimony of John the Baptist concerning Jesus, thus, “He whom God hath sent *speaketh the words of God*; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him”. In John 7:16, Jesus of Nazareth said: “My doctrine is *not mine, but his that sent me*;” and in the 8th chapter and 26th verse: “I have many things to say and to judge of you, but He that sent me is true; and *I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him*;” and at the 38th verse: “*I speak that which I have seen with my Father*”. At the 12th chapter and the 49th verse: “I have not spoken of myself, but the *Father who sent me. He gave me a commandment what I should say*”. John 14:10: “Believest thou not”, he said to Philip, “that I am in the Father and the Father in me? *the words that I*

speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works". Then, at the 24th verse: "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings, and *the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me*". These I consider to be unmistakable illustrations of that feature of the Messiah foretold by Moses and the prophets, "I will put my words in his mouth". Jesus didn't come in his own name, like the false Christs, whom the Jews have, from time to time, received; as he said, "If any man come in his own name, him ye will receive; but *I have come in my Father's name, and ye have not received me*".

Now the argument following upon that is this: that *the words of Jesus of Nazareth are of a kind that can only be explained on the supposition that he is in reality that prophet like unto Moses, in whose mouth the words of God were put*. That, indeed, is the very answer given by the men who were sent to apprehend Jesus; they were struck with his words, and when they returned to the captain of the temple, they said, "*never man spake like this man*". I propose to read you one or two illustrations of this fact that "he spake as never man spake"; and that, therefore, the words of Christ are the words of God; that the words of Christ can only be the words of a man who was no mere man, but the Father of men tabernacling among men by his Spirit, and speaking through this man in words which illustrate the description of him, that "he spoke as one having authority, and not as the scribes". I will read you a specimen of his sayings from Luke 11, commencing at the 29th verse:—

"And when the people were gathered thick together he began to say: This is an evil generation, they seek a sign and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold a greater than Jonas is here. No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed, therefore, that the light which is in thee be not darkness. If thy whole body therefore be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light. And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye

fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you. But woe unto you, Pharisees, for ye tithe mint and rue, and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them. Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. Therefore also saith the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and *some* of them they shall slay and persecute. That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation. From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation. Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered”.

That is a public discourse of Jesus, and I submit that it is speaking as never man spake; a style of discourse not to be accounted for on the Jewish hypothesis — that he was an impostor, but only intelligible on the supposition that he was indeed the Messiah, the prophet like unto Moses, into whose mouth the God of Israel was to put His own words.

I now give you a private discourse of his to his own disciples (John 15), and I call upon you to imagine an impostor speaking in this style, which is the character in which Mr. Stern wishes us to consider the Lord Jesus.

“I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye

bear much fruit: so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love. These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full. This is my commandment, That ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants: for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you . . . These things I command you, that ye love one another. If the world hate you ye know that it hated me before it hated you . . . Remember the word that I said unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you: if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not Him that sent me”.

Take another discourse, which you will find recorded in Luke 12, commencing at the 32nd verse:—

“Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heaven that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is there will your heart be also. Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily, I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. And this know, that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of Man cometh at an hour when ye think not. Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all? And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom *his* lord shall make ruler over his household to give *them* *their* portion of meat in due season? Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But, and if the servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers”.

(Time called.)

MR. STERN: Mr. Chairman and friends: We have now arrived at what I may term the beginning of the end; that is if an end is to come to upon this subject at all. My opponent has taunted me with not having given him sufficient to attack me with. He seems to have been prepared to attack me had I been Mr. Monaet; but as I am not Mr. Monaet, and consequently have not taken up his arguments, I have not received the hard hits that Mr. Roberts was prepared to give him. But I am not here to give him arguments to attack me with. It is for him to prove his affirmation that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, and it is for me to disprove it. It is for him to bring arguments forward, and it is for me to deny them and to show you why I deny them. A number of points have been laid down — namely, the seventy weeks of Daniel, and the virgin as it is called in the English version of Isaiah. I went at once to the points, and I have proved my case from my point of view — from the Jewish point of view — which, of course, is different from his, and which he knew I should do before he came. I have proved to him that the seventh of Isaiah — the passage which he quoted — had nothing to do with Christ. I have proved to him that the passage he quoted in the middle of the chapter really referred to the passages preceding it, and it also referred to the two, or rather the three, chapters following. My friend then shifted his headquarters from the seventh to the fifty-third of Isaiah. I thereupon proved to him that that chapter could have no allusion whatever to Jesus, since it was alluding to a personage who lived before the time of Isaiah. He again referred me to the ninth chapter, and here again I assert that this passage has nothing whatever to do with Jesus. I will just quote it, “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall rest upon his shoulders; and he shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace”. I hold that is still calling attention to the same event which Isaiah was alluding to when he was addressing Ahaz; and when he says, “unto us a child is born”, he is certainly alluding to himself, and his wife, and the child his wife bore. I expect you will differ from me and say he alluded to something different, but you know it is a very easy matter if you wish to quote something to harmonise with any theory which you wish to establish. What my friend had to do was to bring such overwhelming proofs that I could not have had any doubt at all, but he has not done so. I asked him, and it seemed to him rather out of the way — I asked him to produce the originals of the Four Gospels, but after a good deal of wrangling he admitted that Matthew wrote Matthew, Mark wrote Mark, Luke wrote Luke, and John wrote John — the first in Hebrew, and the three last in Greek. The original copies my friend says are lost, and he doesn't seem to have any hope of ever recovering them, nor does he tell us in whose possession they were when they were lost. Well, now, let us examine the position we are in. I came here as a doubter, not alone of Jesus, but I came here as doubter of the value of the testimony in the New Testament; and I have a perfect right to doubt it. “But”, says Mr. Roberts, “you have not, the testimony is sufficient”; and he goes to the old Hebrew Testament and quotes passages, which certainly, wherever he reads seem to refer

to Jesus; but as soon as I read them, they seem just the reverse. Now, I wish with your kind permission to read some quotations from a learned authority, but before doing so I thought of just comparing a passage he has quoted from the New Testament with a few I have cut from the same book. He has shown us of course the beautiful and the best passages he could possibly find of this good individual — of this God of my friend, who was to do all this good. Now with your permission, I will just, in opposition to what he has read, see how good these seem to you. Luke 12:49, 51: “I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled; suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? Nay, but rather division”. Well that is true; he has been the cause of division; I believe it. Matt. 10:34, 36:—

“Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man’s foes *shall be* they of his own household”.

I think this has been fulfilled with a vengeance. Mark 16:16: “He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not *shall be damned*”. Matthew 10:14: “Whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, when ye depart out of their house or city, shake off the dust of your feet”. Here is kindness! “Verily, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city”. I only pity those poor Africans where the Missionaries go to teach these things; they would be far better off if they had never seen them, for one thing is certain, that if they had never heard the gospel they could not be expected to obey it. Mark 4:2: “And he said unto them, unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them”. Then my friends, if I do not understand, Jesus is responsible. He spoke in parables that I might be deceived. If he is the son of God, and if he has power to enlighten and yet withholds that enlightenment, how dare you blame me for not understanding? I see it doesn’t please you for me to show you the bad passages, but when my friend quotes the good ones and leaves the bad ones out, it so happens that I was prepared with the bad ones. I give my opponent the sentence, “Lest at any time they should be converted and their sins be forgiven them”. What becomes of the missionaries, if Jesus has nothing else to do but keep the people blind. Let us go a little farther. In Matthew 4:8, we are told that the devil took Jesus into an exceeding high mountain; and showed him all the kingdoms of the world. My friend has just given you a grand eulogy on Jesus; he says he is not man, and I agree with him — no man would use such words. Here is Jesus, who is no man, but the son of God; here is Jesus, who is supposed to have been present when God created the world, and was there to assist him, according to my friend’s theory.

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. STERN: Actually taken up to the topmost mountain by the devil himself; and

for what purpose do you think? Why for the purpose of showing him the whole world. Jesus ought to have known the whole world long before the devil knew it; Jesus, who was there when God made the world, ought to have known that it was not a plane as he must have thought at that time; else the devil must have been cleverer than he, and took him up to deceive him. If Christ had been God, he would have known that it was a globe, and that, therefore, however high he might go, he could not see it all. But there is another good thing Jesus did. Mark 5:11:—

“Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. And all the devils besought him saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea (they were about two thousand) and were choked in the sea”.

I want to know the use of this, let us just examine it. I can only understand this by thinking that Christ was a Jew who did not like pigs. If so, however, it could not justify him, unless he previously made a bargain with the owners of them. There were a legion of devils — that is 3,000. How were they divided amongst the pigs? 2,000 pigs and 3,000 devils — Were there two devils to some pigs and one to others, or was there one devil and a half to each pig? (Confusion.) Oh, friends, this is legitimate. My friend has shown me his reasons and quoted to me good deeds of Jesus, and told me why I should believe him. He has blamed all the Jews for not accepting Jesus; and I come here to show why I do not accept him, and to show why my fathers rejected him. How unfair it would be to allow Mr. Roberts to say all he likes, and not to hear me. But supposing Christ had wanted to get rid of the devils — I wish he had got rid of *all* the devils — couldn't he have destroyed them without drowning the pigs? But the thing of itself looks so absurd. “Now this was nigh unto the mountains”. We very seldom see a mountain with a steep hill running down into the sea; if they had been under rocks near the sea coast it would have been more intelligible. But I suppose it is one of my friend's grand mysteries, and I will leave him to explain it. Then again Mark 11:12-14, 20, 21:—

“And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry: And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves; for the time of the figs was not *yet*. And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat of fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard it”.

“And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots. And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away”.

I should like to know the beauty of this passage. He goes to the fig tree, knowing — for he was the Son of God, mind — knowing it was not the time of year for figs to grow. How much more reasonable it would have been to make the figs

grow all at once than commit the absurdity of cursing a tree, and causing it to grow nothing at all. One would have been quite as easy to do as the other. But I leave that for those who believe in Christ to reconcile. I shall now proceed to speak about the New Testament. He says the original is lost, but that we have got a copy of the Greek. More shame for you, you ought to have taken better care of it. It seems rather singular that a valuable document like this should have got lost. But Mr. Roberts — because I made an assertion last night which doesn't seem to agree with his theory, as he seems to have come here with ready cut and dried arguments against me — said I disagreed with all the writers of my nation. That is just the identical thing I announced the first night. I said I was not here as representing any body of Jews: that I came here to represent myself only, and I place my words and arguments — having been brought up to the Hebrew faith — against those of Mr. Roberts. Who has more right to explain the Hebrew than a Jew who has been brought up with the Hebrew language? But I will bring you an authority. Mr. Roberts says all the scribes before me differ from me; I will show that the scribes on the Christian side differ from Mr. Roberts. Mosheim, considered one of the fairest and most honourable writers on ecclesiastical history that ever wrote, who exposes the falsities of his own people as well as speaking against the Jews at other times — let us hear what he says: "The place of his birth has not been hitherto fixed with certainty, notwithstanding the deep and laborious researches of the learned in the matter". This is what Mosheim says, who devoted the whole of his time to searching every Greek and Latin book, in order to see what could be found in favour of Christianity. Here you have his words. He says "There is nothing surprising in this when we consider that the first Christians laboured under the same difficulties, and were divided in their opinions concerning the time of Christ's birth. That which appears most probable is that it happened about six months before the death of Herod". Mosheim leaves it in doubt; it shows the honesty of the writer: when a man is uncertain, he should not pin his faith to anything. Mr. Roberts says Matthew wrote Matthew. Let us see whether he did or not. First volume, page 65 —

"The distance of time and the want of records, leaves us at a loss with respect to many interesting circumstances of the peregrinations of the apostles; nor have we any certain or precise accounts of the limits of their voyages, of the particular countries where they sojourned, nor of the times and places in which they finished their glorious course. The stories that are told concerning their arrival and exploits among the Gauls, the English, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too romantic in their nature, and of too recent a date to be received by an impartial enquirer after truth. The greatest part of these fables were forged after the time of Charlemagne, when most of the Christian Churches contended about the antiquity of their origin with as much vehemence as the Arcadians, Egyptians, and Greeks disputed formerly about their seniority and precedence".

That is just what I say, I am here as an impartial enquirer after truth, and I cannot receive it. I will now read with your permission the 381st page, where Mosheim says:

“If the enthusiastic frenzy of the monks exaggerated, in a manner pernicious to the interests of morality, the discipline that is obligatory upon Christians, the interests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost universally adopted in this century, and became a source of innumerable calamities and mischiefs in the succeeding ages. The first of these maxims was ‘That it was an act of virtue to deceive, and lie, when by that means the interests of the church might be promoted;’ and the second equally horrible, though in another point of view, was, that ‘errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, were punishable with civil penalties and corporeal tortures’. The former of these erroneous maxims was now of a long standing; it had been adopted for some ages past, and had produced an incredible number of ridiculous fables, fictitious prodigies, and pious frauds, to the unspeakable detriment of that glorious cause in which they were employed. And it must be frankly confessed, that the greatest men and most eminent saints of this century, were more or less tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evident to such as look with an attentive eye into their writings and their actions. We would willingly except from this charge, Ambrose and Hilary, Augustin, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome; but truth, which is more respectable than these venerable fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accusation. We may add also, that it was, probably, the contagion of this pernicious maxim, that engaged Sulpitius Severus, who is far from being, in the general, a puerile or credulous historian, to attribute so many miracles to St. Martin. The other maxim, relating to the justice and expediency of punishing error, was introduced with those serene and peaceful times which the accession of Constantine to the imperial throne procured to the church. It was from that very period approved by many, enforced by several examples during the contests that arose with the Priscillianists and Donatists, confirmed and established by the authority of Augustin, and thus transmitted to the following ages.

When we cast an eye towards the lives and morals of Christians at this time, we find, as formerly, a mixture of good and evil; some eminent for their piety, others infamous for their crimes. The number, however, of immoral and unworthy Christians began so to increase, that the examples of real piety and virtue became extremely rare. When the terrors of persecution were totally dispelled; when the church, secured from the efforts of its enemies, enjoyed the sweets of prosperity and peace; when most of the bishops exhibited to their flock the contagious examples of arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, and strife, with other vices too numerous to

mention; when the inferior rulers and doctors of the church fell into slothful and opprobrious negligence of the duties of their respective stations, and employed in vain wranglings and idle disputes, that zeal and attention that were due to the culture of piety and to the instruction of their people, and when (to complete the enormity of this horrid detail) multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity, not by the power of conviction and argument, but by the prospect of gain and the fear of punishment: then it was, indeed, no wonder that the church was contaminated with shoals of profligate Christians, and that the virtuous few were, in a manner, oppressed and overwhelmed with the superior numbers of the wicked and licentious”.

“Multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity”, from what, do you think? Mosheim says “not by the power of conviction or argument”, as I have come here to-night; but two things drove them to it. My friend taunts me with being blind, and not being able to see, but I can see, I can find out these arguments from Mosheim. They were driven to make a profession, not by these, but “by a prospect of gain, and the fear of punishment”. Those were the reasons. I say in face of such authorities as these what are we to believe? I can also quote you others; I can quote you Dr. Lardner, Dr. Alexander, and numerous others, who have devoted their whole lives to find out every particle of truth, and the conclusion they have come to is that there is no evidence that these documents are genuine. How can I deal with a subject like this, when he says he cannot accept my authority. I have here authorities like Mosheim which I leave to your judgment and consideration.

(Time called.)

MR.ROBERTS: With the corruptions of the early ecclesiastical saints, I have nothing whatever to do. I should be quite as willing as Mr. Stern to prefer an indictment against the heads and pillars of the church that present themselves before the world as the Church of Christ. But that is not the question we are at all discussing; we are discussing whether the facts recorded of and principles enunciated by Jesus of Nazareth justify the belief entertained concerning him that he is the Messiah. In so far as Mr. Stern’s remarks have borne upon that point, I will briefly notice them, though there is very little indeed to notice. The attitude taken by Christ with regard to the fig-tree is perfectly explicable in view of the object intended to be accomplished, and that object was the illustration to his disciples of the power of faith, as the context shows. When the disciples had recognised the result of Christ’s words to the fig tree, he said to them if they had faith as much as a grain of mustard seed, they would not only be able to do what he had done but much stranger things than that. Is it a very wonderful thing for a teacher to illustrate what he wants to teach to children? (for the disciples were children then in relation to the great truths which lay at the bottom of the system

of the truth of which Jesus was the centre). Mr. Stern's criticism is a mere child's criticism. He then finds fault with Jesus for sending the herd of pigs into the Sea of Galilee. It shows how little apprehension he has of his own system, the system he speaks of under the name of Judaism: for what is Judaism if it be not a system of obedience based on the law of Moses? Was it not a commandment to eschew the use, and therefore the cultivation of the pig? It was; and Jesus in his treatment of the great herd of swine illustrated the fact which he stated at another time in these words: "Think not that I have come to destroy the law and the prophets; *I am not come to destroy but to fulfil.*" Jesus vindicated the Jewish law in the very thing which this Jew finds fault with him for doing.

Then he finds fault with Jesus for uttering a true prophecy — "Think not I am come to send peace on earth". Mr. Stern admits that the work of Jesus has had precisely the effect which Jesus foretold. His mission was not at that time to bring the peace that the world will afterwards see, when he comes again. The object was to take out from amongst Jews and Gentiles a faithful people, upon the basis of voluntary obedience, and he well knew that these principles, operating upon society, would produce these results of division of whose occurrence Mr. Stern is a witness.

Then he asks why are the Jews to be held responsible for not believing, if they have been made blind? I do not say that they will be held responsible. Their blindness is a national punishment for a former offence for which they were responsible. He mistakes me for a missionary. I am as much prepared to maintain that the clerical doctrine of damnation in hell is unfounded in truth, as I am that Mr. Stern's doctrine of the Messiah is opposed to the prophets. I am prepared to prove that the rule of God's moral government is that the punishment of sin is death — that death will at last obliterate every trace of disobedience from the universe; all disobedient Jews as all disobedient Gentiles. I admit that if the popular doctrine were true — that blinded Israel will be sent to live in eternal agony — there would be great force in Mr. Stern's argument; but it has no force against my position. We are all born into the world without inheritance of eternal life; and Jesus of Nazareth said "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins". Therefore, if he be the Messiah, Mr. Stern and the unbelieving Jews generally are doomed. But suppose there was any force at all in Mr. Stern's argument on being made blind — I mean any force against Jesus, would it not recoil upon Mr. Stern's own prophets? Does Mr. Stern believe in the prophets? He says he is an orthodox Jew; and therefore I am bound to assume that he does. Let me then call your attention to Isaiah 6:9, where this mission is confided to Israel as the merited punishment of Israel for having, century after century, rebelled against the servants of God. "Go and tell this people, hear ye, indeed, but understand not; and see ye, indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart and convert, and be healed".

And if any man challenges God's right to do such a thing, we shall simply have an illustration of a finite mortal criticising the doings of unsearchable wisdom.

Mr. Stern's position with regard to the originals is really too trifling to notice. I deny that he can produce the Hebrew originals of the writings of Moses, if he means the real documents that he wrote — the very parchment which the pen of Moses moved upon in inscribing the words he wrote. The documents no longer exist; for it was not in the nature of the substance on which they were written to last so long; but does that fact interfere with the faith of the Jews? That it does not, is evident from Mr. Stern's belief in them; and again I say, if Mr. Stern can believe in the writings of Moses, in the absence of the originals, having otherwise good reasons for doing so, he cannot find fault with me under precisely similar circumstances, doing the same thing with regard to the New Testament.

Having noticed so much in his last speech as calls for notice, I proceed with the evidence upon which I was engaged, and I do so by anticipating a retort that might be made in connection with the evidence I have already produced. It may be said that Jesus of Nazareth, in the position in which he is put forward as God manifest in the flesh, is an interference with the Jewish doctrine delivered by Moses, that there is but one God. I, therefore, wish to call your attention to this, that the doctrine of the New Testament is not that Jesus is a second God, but that he is subordinately related to the great fountain of universal power, who revealed himself to Israel by Moses and the prophets. This can be shown by quoting the testimony of those who quoted the testimony of Christ. I first refer you to the Acts of the Apostles 2:22, where Peter, the leader of the Apostles, gives the definition in these words: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, *a man approved of God among you by miracles and signs which GOD DID by him* in the midst of you, as ye, yourselves also know". This does not present the Trinitarian idea, which I admit is a great obstacle with the Jews; but an obstacle that does not exist in my case, because I uphold the doctrine that there is but one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ, His son. In Acts 10:38, we have the same doctrine enunciated. Peter again being the speaker whilst in the house of Cornelius, where he says that *GOD anointed Jesus with the power which he exercised*. In 1 Cor. 3:23, we find God put in a position of supremacy over Jesus. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says "All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things to come: all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and *Christ is GOD'S*". In this you see a gradually-ascending chain; we are at the bottom; Christ intermediate; God at the top, an order which you will see presented in 1 Cor. 11:3: "I would have you to know that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man; *and the head of Christ is GOD*". In Ephesians 4:5-6, the same idea stands prominently out: "There is one Lord (that is the Lord Jesus Christ) . . . one God and Father of all, who is *above all* and through all, and in you all". In the first chapter of Heb., a very beautiful epistle, you find Paul presenting Jesus in the same light: "GOD, who at sundry times and

in divers manners, spake, in time past, unto the fathers by the prophets, *hath, in these last days, spoken unto us by His Son*, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down by the right hand of Majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels hath he said, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; and again, I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son?"

It is thus shown that *God spoke through Jesus of Nazareth*; and this is a doctrine which is surely not impossible for a Jew to receive, seeing that God spake through the angel at the bush, and when that angel appeared to Moses, did he not say, "I AM THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" If God can speak through an angel, surely He can speak through a man who was begotten by Himself, and whom He has provided as a channel of approach to Himself. In 1 John 1 the same doctrine is presented: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the word of life (*for the life was manifested*, and we have seen it and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His son Jesus Christ". In the gospel of John, the first two verses, you have the same doctrine expressed: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and THE WORD WAS GOD; the same was in the beginning with God, and was manifested unto us, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth".
(Time called.)

MR. STERN: Of course, these long sentences are perfectly understood by Mr. Roberts — that everything is God. Mr. Roberts understands it and I hope you do. But still, my friends, that is his Christian love toward me: he taunts me with something like madness: that I, a single Jew, should come forward to criticise Jesus. Does he think this will gain him credit? Why, I should have thought that at least he would have reserved it for some other occasion. He taunted me with being a Jew and with having the madness to come forward. Why did he accept the challenge? I expected you were a gentleman, sir (turning to Mr. Roberts); I expected you were an honourable man. I expected I was coming before an English audience who would allow me an opportunity, though a Jew, of expressing my opinion. Why taunt me with it? Why make use of the term, and address me by the name with the greatest sarcasm? How would you like to be called a Methodist? "*This Methodist*", or "*this Quaker*", or "*this Roman Catholic*"? I would have more respect for my opponent. But I will leave this matter, appealing to your own

sense of justice and to your judgment, as to how far Mr. Roberts was justified. He says it doesn't matter; we must take no notice of what "*this Jew*" says about producing the originals. For if I ask him to produce the originals of the New Testament, he asks me to produce the originals of Moses. If this is the right way of arguing the subject, I do not know what sort of logic you will call it. You do not doubt Moses; then why ask me to produce the originals? But as to the New Testament writings, I doubt them upon the greatest authority. My friend says the evidence he produces is overwhelming. Indeed! It doesn't seem to affect me. He says Christ Jesus is the Son of God, and he makes him up a mystery — three in one and one in three — you know.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN here interposed, saying: Mr. Stern's expression applies to those who hold the Trinitarian doctrine; Mr. Roberts has stated that he doesn't hold the Trinitarian doctrine.

MR. STERN: I have come here to give reasons against Jesus of Nazareth, and I class Mr. Roberts among Christians generally. (Confusion, which lasted some time.) I have lost five minutes, and I claim it from you. I was going to address those who do not call Mr. Roberts a gentleman; but I will keep my temper, my friend, only if he should try to throw something on my head, I will try to give him one back again. When I challenged Mr. Roberts, I didn't think of coming here to ask your opinions as to what I should say. I gave him the challenge, and he knew very well that I came here to deny that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. How can I deny it unless you allow me to speak what I have to say against him? How is it possible? Another thing; you would not like, as Englishmen, that it should go forth that discussion was not allowed in the Temperance Hall in 1871, that the one on the side of Jesus had all the favour shown him, and the Jew was not allowed to express his opinions; you would really not like that. With your permission I will as calmly as possible examine the subject. My friend says bring the originals of Moses; I simply say this, Moses is not in discussion, I told him this last night, that when we discussed Christianity *versus* Judaism, I should be prepared to bring all documents which are necessary. I have quoted from Mosheim what he says about the earliest fathers who were supposed to be the translators of these documents, and here is something more. "As this divine religion was to be propagated to the ends of the earth, it was necessary that Christ should choose a certain number of persons through the whole course of his ministry. To answer the facts of this grand mystery, it required such men as the apostles were. They were the lowest of the low; it was impossible to get respectable men". Let us go further. "And these apostles (page 63), were men without education". So Mosheim considers. But the Jews were blind. Although Jesus was continually working miracles, he shut the eyes of the Jews so that they could not see. I challenged Mr. Roberts to discuss this question. I would not give a challenge to the man whom Mr. Monnet defeated; I wanted a learned man like Mr. Roberts, yet I expect from a learned man that he

will at least give fair play. Jesus called thirteen persons, only one of whom had acquaintance with Jewish and Christian learning. The others were picked men of "mean extraction", respectable men he could not get. The only apostle who had any learning was Paul. Mr. Roberts told me last night that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and the rest in Greek. I ask him how can he expect illiterate and poor Jews, who never knew anything about philosophy, to write in Greek. I should like you to find me a man among the poorest and meanest of the Christians who could write as these illiterate Jews are said to have written. I say how is it possible for me to believe documents upon such authority, when I have such authorities as those I can bring in support of my arguments? How can I believe the New Testament? How unreasonable from a learned man; I say it truly; for I know Mr. Roberts to be a learned man; how unreasonable for a gentleman of his learning and understanding to answer me in the way he does. His friends ask me to keep my temper, but surely you must admit that I, like others, am a creature of circumstances; I cannot help it when it rises within me, I can simply control it. I am not made the same as a personage whom I do not think it necessary to mention. I will quote a few more beautiful sentences to see whether this shall be the means of making me embrace Christianity. I shall commence with Peter. John 18:10: "Then Simon Peter having a sword, drew it and smote the High Priest's servant and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus". That is how it states it in John. In Acts 3:23, it says: "It shall come to pass that everyone which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people". Those are Peter's own words. Luke 22:54: "Then took they him (Christ) and led him and brought him unto the High Priest's house, and Peter followed afar off. When they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall and were set down together, Peter sat down among them; but a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him and said, This man was also with him; and he denied her, saying Woman, I know him not". Now then, here Peter lays down a rule, that whoever denies that prophet shall be cut off, and yet this cowardly liar himself denies him, perhaps two or three hours after these very words were spoken. What reliance can be placed in books which contradict each other in this manner. (A voice: Peter didn't say it before he denied him.) If he didn't say it, then why does it say he did? The book must be wrong and liable to error, the same as all other books. If these are the words that are to lead me to Christ, I wish to remain where I am. I will quote some other passages. 2 John, 10th verse: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed". This has been fulfilled with a vengeance. I daresay my friend will say I cut the ground from under my feet again. "Neither bid him God speed". There has been a time within the last fifty years, when a Jew could not live in sight of London: could not get a house there.

THE CHAIRMAN here said Mr. Stern had lost some time in complaining about the audience not giving him a hearing. He didn't think that was just, there had been a little interruption, but it was very slight. He would advise Mr. Stern not to lose

time by making unnecessary complaints. If there was any material interruption, he would immediately put a stop to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish there were time to follow all the little points Mr. Stern has raised. I must content myself with one or two. They are all equally fallacious, and the last is certainly no exception. The case of Peter is not in the position he represented. Moses does not say “Whosoever shall *deny* that prophet shall be cut off”, but whosoever will not *hearken* to “that prophet”, in the sense of ultimately receiving and submitting to him, shall be destroyed. His disciple Peter, under great pressure gave way to the temptation to deny him for a moment. It was but a moment. Immediately “he went out and wept bitterly”. And is there no such thing as forgiveness? Is not the God of Israel a gracious God, forgiving iniquity and transgression? Have the Jews no sins to be forgiven, and will not forgiveness be extended to them if they repent? Even the murder of His own Son, He offers to forgive on conditions of repentance and faith.

Then he raised a question with regard to men who wrote the New Testament. He admits they were illiterate, and contends they were unable to write these documents, and therefore it was not written by them. I answer the argument upon the principle that shines through this little remark of the Jews which we find in John 7:15, where it says the Jews marvelled, saying “*How knoweth this man (Jesus) letters, HAVING NEVER LEARNED?*” Let Mr. Stern answer that question with regard to Jesus, and he will answer it with regard to his disciples. It is one of the strongest evidences of the Messiahship of Jesus that in connection with his word, illiterate men performed that which was impossible for them to do unless supernaturally assisted, which they were. The Spirit was sent upon them and produced results which caused the Jews to marvel. As we read in Acts 4:13, “Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived *that they were unlearned and ignorant men, THEY MARVELLED*”. What is the explanation? They had something besides their illiterateness. What was it? *God worked with them, confirming their words with signs following.* The promise of Christ was fulfilled, that the Spirit of truth should come to them and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had spoken to them.

Then Mr. Stern seemed to be very much stung by my calling him a Jew. From my point of view, it is the most honourable name in the earth. Salvation is of the Jews. Christ was a Jew. All the apostles were Jews. I look forward to the time when ten men shall take hold of the skirts of *him that is a Jew* and say “We will go with thee, for we have heard that God is WITH THEE”. But when the time comes, the “God with them” will be Jesus of Nazareth whom they crucified — Emmanuel.

The next branch of my argument is, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah because of the great works which he wrought; because of the miracles that he performed, none of which will be controverted as to their nature if admitted to have taken place. The opponents of Christianity give the answer to them that Mr.

Monaet gave. Jesus told his disciples they were not to receive false Christs although they should show signs and wonders (Mark 13:22). The argument is that if false Christs could work signs and wonders, the working of signs and wonders is no sign that Jesus was the true Christ. The answer to that is that Christ admitted the possibility of other men doing the things that appeared miraculous, but rested his claims on the vast difference between what he did and what other men did. He challenges comparison. He says in John 15:24, "If I had not done among them the WORKS WHICH NONE OTHER MAN DID, they had not had sin". Where was there ever a man before him, or since, that walked upon the sea, and stilled the tempest by a word of command? Where is the man that ever fed thousands of people with a few loaves of bread? Where was ever the man before him that raised the dead by a word? Never in all the category of false Christs — never in all the history of impostures, has there been any approach to these great wonders, which, as Paul said of other things, were not done in a corner. If time admitted, which it does not, I should have liked to go very largely into this point, to demonstrate the historic reality of the things related of Christ. But I must hastily pass on the last point of my argument, which is, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, because he rose from the dead. Now my evidence upon that question is very simple, but exceedingly strong — strong because of its simplicity. What are the facts of the case? They are such as are not doubted, as regards the principal of them at all events; and that is this, that after Jesus of Nazareth was crucified by Pilate at the instigation of the Jews, his disciples proclaimed to the Jewish public that he had risen again. They did not say "We believe it because somebody has told us, or because we are convinced as a matter of argument that it must be so; because we have some theory on the matter. No. They said, "He is risen again, for *we have seen him, WE HAVE EATEN AND DRUNK WITH HIM SINCE HE ROSE FROM THE DEAD. We are his witnesses.*" I will just quote one specimen of the kind of testimony they gave on this most important point. In Acts 10:40, you find Peter — who denied his Lord, but was forgiven — declaring "Him God raised up the third day and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before God, even to us *who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead*". The testimony did not relate to a single interview with the Lord merely; but applied to a period of forty days, during which he repeatedly showed himself to his disciples. "To whom also *he showed himself alive after his passion, by MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God*" (Acts 1:3). Now these men everywhere declared the same thing, and with one uniform result — that, namely, of persecution; at the very threshold of their career, the authorities laid hold of Peter and put him in prison, and confiscated the goods of all in Jerusalem who dared to believe his testimony. The other disciples gave the same testimony. They went everywhere throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria declaring that the Lord had risen, and had commanded them to preach faith in him for the remission of sins. The result to the disciples was in every case the same. It brought upon them degradation, and evil

and pain; and at last, in almost every case, death. Now what is the explanation of such an extraordinary phenomenon? Mr. Stern asks your attention to a thief at the bar as affording an explanation; he says, "Oh, a thief will tell a story of course, to get himself out of a scrape". Just so; but where is the man that will tell a story to get himself out of a scrape? The way for the disciples to have kept out of the scrape was to hold their tongues; or, having got into the scrape, the way to get out of it was to tell just the very opposite story to that which they told. If they had said, "We confess we have been deceiving the people. Jesus never rose, but is now rotting in the place where we laid his stolen dead body", they would immediately and gladly have been let out of the scrape and praised amongst the Jews as honest men. Instead of that, they persisted in a declaration, which, if not true, was of no benefit to them, but brought them continually into that which Mr. Stern suggests they made to get out of — a scrape.

The facts upon which my argument is based are doubted. No one can deny that the Christians of the first century testified that Christ had risen, because they had seen him, and no man can deny that this testimony brought upon them every species of deprivation. Therefore we have to believe first that they were honest men; for none but honest men will bring upon themselves continued poverty, starvation, and death, by adhering to a statement. Why is a lie ever told? That the liar may get good to himself or screen himself from harm — like Mr. Stern's thief. Did the disciples of Christ screen themselves from harm by what they said? On the contrary Paul said, "For Christ's sake we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted and have no certain dwelling-place. We are made as the filth of the world and off-scouring of all things unto this day". These were no liars. There is only one hypothesis upon which you can get rid of their testimony, and that is not a sustainable one, namely, that they were mad. This I suppose is the hypothesis that Mr. Stern would select. But it will be very hard work to maintain it in the face of the marvellous combination of greatness and goodness which he admits in saying that illiterate men could not write such epistles as the apostles wrote. There is no man can read the epistles of Paul and say he was a madman. They show him to have been a cool, clear-headed, logical, practical, sensible man; and having mentioned his name, I will speak of his case, which forms one of the strongest bulwarks of the Christian faith; for the facts of his case must have been intimately known at the time. Brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, who was a man of great authority as a leader amongst the Pharisees, Paul, when the disciples first began to declare that Christ had risen, took the lead in endeavouring to extirpate them as a class from the nation. A man of great intelligence, a man of learning, and of undoubted honesty of purpose, and of extraordinary energy and enterprise. All of a sudden, this man, whilst on his way to Damascus, with letters from the Sanhedrin empowering him to apprehend Christians — all of a sudden, this man turns round and begins to preach the faith he sought to destroy. What is the explanation of this extraordinary incontrovertible fact? Let me read Paul's own explanation of it, and judge ye between Mr. Stern and Paul. Acts 23 brings before us Paul, who, after a prolonged journey among the Gentiles, testifying the

mission of Christ, appears in Jerusalem. Some of the Jews recognise him and say, "Men of Israel, help; this is the man that teaches all men everywhere against the people and the law, and this place". A great uproar ensues, in which Paul is likely to be torn to pieces. He is at length rescued by the Roman soldiers, and he asks permission to address the people from the stairs; and obtaining permission, delivers this speech, which is Paul's explanation of an otherwise inexplicable career:

"Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith, I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day. And I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women. As also the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders: from whom also I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damascus, to bring them which were there bound unto Jerusalem, for to be punished. And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest. And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus. And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there, came unto me, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard. And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. And it came to pass, that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance: and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee: And when the blood of thy martyr, Stephen, was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. And he said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the

Gentiles. And they gave him audience unto this word, and then lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live”.

(Time called.)

MR. STERN: You have heard the beautiful passages that my friend has just quoted: all I have to say is, “I don’t believe it”. I still keep to my subject; I hold these are lies, forgeries, and falsehoods, and I will tell you why — because I take against Mr. Roberts the statements of Mosheim. My friend says, What interest was it to those men to lie? Mosheim says they considered it a virtue to lie, when the interests of the Church required it. And these documents, the originals of which you say are lost — more shame for you, that you didn’t take better care of them. Mr. Roberts has quoted from St. Paul some good sayings, but I will quote some of the bad ones. Paul says, “I robbed other churches and took wages of them, to do you service”. My friend has such a nice way of quoting all the good things, and leaving all the other things out. Am I to believe in a man who actually acknowledges that he has robbed other churches and taken wages, to do them service? That is very mild! I will quote two or three more passages of Paul: “For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His service, why yet am I judged as a sinner?” (Rom. 3:7). If he really has robbed and lied in the interests of the Church, why should he be looked upon as a sinner? Again, “If any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant” (1 Cor. 14:38). The Church acquired the greatest power when its people were ignorant, and kept them ignorant. Why? Because if they had not, they might have been able to read those Christian books. Now that the people have got to understand, what is the result? Even this New Testament of yours, which Mr. Roberts brings as an authority, which Mr. Roberts says contains truths, is now sent up to the Synod, in London to be altered. Why? Because the people can see the forgeries and falsehoods the book contains; and they want to take them out, and to put something else in their stead. (A voice: It’s a lie.) My friend says it is a lie, but it is a fact. (Some confusion here occurred, and the Chairman had some difficulty in restoring order.) How unreasonable it is; my friend is allowed to quote good things out of the book, and I want to show you the bad ones. Why does he persist in quoting them, when I say they are lies and falsehoods. I tell you they are forgeries. I say, “Bring proofs”. And you insist upon quoting Paul; then why not allow me to quote his bad sayings? My friend doesn’t like me to do this. Paul says, “As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach unto you any other gospel than ye have received, let him be accursed”. Are these a godly man’s words? Does it take Jesus to inspire Paul — your dead Jesus who has risen again, as you presume; does it take Jesus to die and be crucified for the purpose of inspiring Paul to tell lies? Does it take all that for Paul to say, “Let any man be accursed”, because he doesn’t believe the doctrine of this book. If this is all, I say I will remain with those who do not believe it all my life; and if I am to be accursed for it, I will take my chance. “A man that is an

heretic after the first admonition, reject". Why must I be rejected, simply because I won't believe these forgeries? "I would that they were cut off that trouble you. Nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with *guile*". That is what Paul says. "But (Acts 13:8) Elymas the Sorcerer withstood them". "Then Saul (who is also called Paul), filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, and said, 'Oh, full of all subtlety and of all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season'. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand". I do not believe it. "And some days after (Acts 15:36), Paul said unto Barnabas, 'Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do'. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark; but Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who had departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder, one from the other". That is a very nice thing, isn't it? "For this cause . . . God gave them up unto vile affections". This is a passage from Rom. 1:26-27. I advise everyone but ladies to read it; I think it is too disgusting for them; it is really too disgusting; it just caught my eye. I will give you another; of course, I must leave you to be the judge, now, of Paul. "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed:" this is what is said in the New Testament. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first:" that is what Paul said (1 Cor. 15). "We who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds". Let us only hope it will not be a damp cloud, or they will catch cold. "To meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord". What — in the air? I wish them well over it. I don't want to be there. That is one of the grand mysteries, and I will leave it to my friend to explain. My friend has stated that no man ever did what Jesus did. He walked on the sea. Of course I don't believe it' but suppose he did, what does that prove to me? Does it prove that he is the Son of God? Is it proof because a man walks on the sea, and is born of a woman without a father, that he is the Son of God? To me it only proves that he can do something which I do not know how to do. What has he done? I am sure if he had only left the secret behind, it would be some good. Tell me what good he has done? Then Mr. Roberts quotes to me that beautiful passage about Christ turning water into wine. I will refer you to the passage. "Jesus saith unto them, Fill the water pots with water; and they filled them up to the brim. And he said unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast, and they bare it. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was (but the servants that drew the water knew)—[Yes, the servants knew all

about it, because they knew the trick] — the governor of the feast called the bridegroom and said, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now”. If this is a test for a man to be looked upon as the Son of God — and God himself sometimes — if this is a test for me to believe in him, why then there is a friend of mine in Birmingham, whom I have not seen for the last eight years, he not alone can turn the water into wine, but he will take a bottle of water, and he will pour out of that bottle all sorts of wine; you have only got to mention what sort you want, and he will give it to you. But do I look upon Professor Hermann as a god, or connected in any way with a ghost — I mean the Holy Ghost; I told you so; I do not know the meaning of the word ghost, nor Holy Ghost, nor do I know where he gets his translation from. Well, Professor Hermann can do something which I do not know how to do; but his servants know very well, as did the servants of Jesus. But it is not because he can do that, that I shall worship him; my friend doesn't want me to worship Professor Hermann. Well, my friend didn't quote this, but it happens, very fortunately, that I have it here: “I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened; which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them”. I should like to know what my friend means by hell? I do not know any Hebrew word that would give him such a translation. “And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire!” I should like to know how that could be done. I should like to know how large hell is, and how large the lake of fire is to throw the lot into. These are some of the grand mysteries again. I do not believe it; but he will explain it to you, no doubt. “I am he that liveth and was dead, and have the keys of hell and death”.

(Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS: I refer Mr. Stern to a well-known word in his own language for the Scripture idea of hell, and that is *sheol*, of which the word *hades* is the Greek equivalent. The meaning he has unintentionally supplied in his last quotation in saying that Jesus has the keys of it. *Sheol* is a place unseen; a well-known Hebrew equivalent for the grave. He says he does not believe in the Holy Ghost.

MR. STERN: In ghosts.

MR. ROBERTS: Does he believe in *Ruacha kodush*?

MR. STERN: Yes, in *Ruacha kodush*.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the Holy Spirit of which the English phrase “Holy Ghost” is a corruption. The Holy Ghost that came upon Mary at Bethlehem, and led to the production of this marvellous man, was the Holy Spirit of the Mighty One of Israel. Surely there ought to be nothing difficult in this for a Jew to receive. As for the extreme modesty which he professed as a bar to the full discussion of the

subject, I will only say that the Scriptures of truth, honour and common sense recognise none of the prurient mysteries that are known only to impure minds. "To the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing clean". The only other point in his remarks which I will notice is his quotations from Mosheim. I altogether deny the applicability of Mosheim's testimony to the matters I have produced. To what age of Christianity does Mosheim's testimony refer? Does it refer to the days of the apostles and their disciples? Will it be said of them that they taught falsehood as a virtue? Never, never! Mosheim's remarks have reference to those dark ages in European history when a corrupt and Jesuitical priesthood were in the ascendancy, and the people demoralised by their teaching. And it indicates the desperateness of Mr. Stern's case that he finds it necessary to even insinuate that such principles were those of Christ Jesus, who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and without sin". His attempt to prove them to have been the principles of the apostles by quotations from the writings of Paul, is even more to be deprecated than his attempt to make the early Christians responsible for Papal corruption. He has quoted a statement of Paul — "If the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory", as if it were a definition by Paul of Paul's principles; whereas it is really a suggestion that Paul puts into the mouth of a supposed caviller, and which he instantly repudiates, saying that he is *slanderosly reported* when represented as saying, "Let us do evil that good may come". Mr. Stern has added himself to the list of Paul's slanderers, but I dare say that gives him little concern. I am sorry the time is so limited with so much that might be considered, but I must make the best of it. I must rapidly summarise what remains to be said. Usually the Jews, in their opposition to Jesus, point to the testimony of the prophets that the Jewish Messiah is to reign in Jerusalem as universal King of the earth, and ask how Jesus answers to that. I admit that the Jesus of popular preaching does not answer to it, but I should like to have shown that the case is altogether different with the Jesus of the New Testament. I should have liked by copious references to show that the mission of Jesus of Nazareth is to return a second time to the scene of his sufferings, and there to be exalted as King of Israel and Monarch of the Whole World. But the time failing, I must content myself with that simple definition, and proceed to say that in all possible things by which the Jewish Messiah could be recognised, Jesus of Nazareth answers to them. I have proved their applicability to him, as to—

1. —The *time* when he should appear.
2. —The *place* (Bethlehem) where he should be born.
3. —The *family* from which it was promised he should be extracted.
4. —The *character* in which he should first be manifested.
5. —The *way* in which the *Jews should receive him*.
6. —The *manner* in which they should *treat him*.
7. —The manner of his death.

8. —The effects of his death.
9. —His resurrection.
10. —The marvellous relation he should sustain both to his own nation and the Gentiles as the manifestation of divine power and wisdom.

And as I have intimated, I could largely show that Jesus of Nazareth, according to the predictions of the New Testament will answer in the fullest particulars to all that is promised concerning the Messiah's coming glory. I now simply have to deal briefly with the attitude of the Jewish nation toward him. They unanimously reject him, although they did not do so in the generation in which he appeared, (for as they are obliged to admit, many thousands of Jews believed on him), they take comfort from their collective unbelief. They seem to think it impossible that they can be mistaken in the matter. Have they forgotten their past history? Let me remind them that in all their generations, they have shown themselves wonderfully prone to go astray from things divine. They have in many cases accepted false Christs. I dare say Mr. Stern, if he is informed enough, can recall passages in the history of his nation in which they have submitted to the leadership of undoubted impostors, men who have in no particular answered to the description of their Messiah in the prophets. Time after time have they fallen into that snare and led themselves into national disasters, in which they would have been destroyed had it not been for the watchfulness of the great Supreme Ruler, who *for the sake of his own great name*, has preserved them a remnant to this time. I will read the description of them by Moses 3,000 years ago, and ask you to mark how signally his words have been verified in the whole course of their history since, and certainly not least of all, in their treatment of Jesus of Nazareth. In Deuteronomy 31:16, you have a wonderful composition introduced thus:—

“And the LORD said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and *this people will rise up, and go a whoring after the gods of the strangers of the land*, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake me, and break my covenant which I have made with them. Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them, and I will hide my face from them, and they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them: so that they will say in that day, Are not these evils come upon us because our God is not among us? And I will surely hide my face in that day, for all the evils which they shall have wrought in that they are turned unto other gods. Now, therefore, write ye this song for you and teach it to the children of Israel; put it in their mouths that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel. For when I shall have brought them into the land which I swore unto their fathers, that floweth with milk and honey, and they shall have eaten and filled themselves, and waxen fat, then will they turn unto other gods, and serve them, and provoke me, and break my covenant. And it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles are befallen them, that this song shall testify against them as a witness; for it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed.”

Moses therefore wrote this song the same day, and we have it now, and I will read it to you (Deut. 32):

“Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth. My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass. Because I will publish the name of the LORD: ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he. They have corrupted themselves, their spot is not the spot of his children: they are a perverse and crooked generation. Do ye thus requite the LORD, O foolish people and unwise? is he not thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee? Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will show thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee. When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the LORD'S portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings: So the LORD alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields; and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock. Butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, with the fat of kidneys of wheat; and thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape. But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked — thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness — then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation. They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger. They sacrificed unto devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee. And when the LORD saw it, he abhorred them because of the provoking of his sons, and of his daughters. And he said, I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end shall be: for they are a very froward generation, children in whom is no faith. They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities: and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people [and I am here to-night as an illustration of the fulfilment of this]. I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation. For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will

heap mischiefs upon them; I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction: I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust. The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also with the man of grey hairs. I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men. Were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy, lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our hand is high, and the LORD hath not done all this. For they are a nation void of counsel, neither is there any understanding in them. O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end. How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except their Rock had sold them, and the LORD had shut them up?"

(Time called.)

MR. STERN: The big guns have been fired, and the battle is over, but so far from my friend making any impression on me, so far from his shots having hurt me, so far from the arguments pointed at me having made the least impression to make me embrace Christianity, they have only brought out the greater feelings I have against it. (Hisses.) Oh! hiss away, and it will only show your beautiful Christianity. (Renewed hissing.) It will only show you can hiss what does not please you. My friend taunts me because I said I don't believe in the Holy Ghost; but he has not told the difference between an ordinary ghost and a holy one. I, like him, have a great deal more to say. It would take me at least three weeks more to say all I have to say; and I am perfectly satisfied that if I only had the time to give verse and chapter for you to go home and compare them, I am perfectly satisfied you would never believe in Jesus any more. My friend asked me if I believed in *ruacha kodush*? Of course. The word *ruach* is "wind", and *kodush* is holy; and if a holy wind sometimes causes virgins to conceive, I should advise all respectable ladies to keep out of the draught. (A voice: It is blasphemy.) Then I will blaspheme as long as I live.

[THE GENTLEMAN (a Jew converted to orthodox Christianity), who thus characterised the remarks of Mr. Stern, then rose and attempted to obtain a hearing for himself, repeatedly exclaiming, in an excited manner, that he would not allow blasphemy in his presence.

THE CHAIRMAN refused to hear him, and after some minutes' confusion the gentleman was prevailed upon to sit down.]

MR. STERN: I consider that that gentleman has come here for the purpose of disturbing the meeting. I am sure we have gone on very nicely, with the exception of a few interruptions. I am sure I will excuse them. I was perfectly satisfied that I should say something you would not like. Well, my friend says he will place me

along with the slanderers of Paul. If I have slandered him I am sure I have slandered him truthfully from my convictions. I have come forward like a man and publicly announced my convictions, and if I have slandered Paul, I wish to be judged by those great intellects that are to be found in this country. The next thing my friend asks me is respecting the ages to which one of my quotations from Mosheim refers. He says the statements he makes with reference to the policy of the early church do not refer to the apostles. I have told you that they could not write, that they were illiterate men, that they could not write these books at all. But my friend says they did write them, although they could not. He says the originals have been lost; and when I quote Mosheim, I quote him merely to show what sort of people they were who are supposed to have written them. I say the translators have misrepresented everything, and these things could never have been in existence or there would have been something left of them. I want to know what the discussion has been about. He has yet to show me why Jesus was crucified, why he was to be three days and three nights in the grave, and yet only remained thirty hours, and why he should rise again and go to heaven; and I yet want to know where in the Hebrew there is an equivalent for the word heaven at all. We have not got an equivalent for heaven, so I do not know where Jesus is. But has he been crucified at all? that is the question. I maintain that according to the rules of English Grammar he has not (Luke 23:26). "And as they led him (Jesus) away they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him (Simon) they laid the cross that he might bear it after Jesus". I wish you particularly to pay attention to these few passages; it says they caught hold of one Simon coming out of the country, and on him they laid the cross. "And there followed him". The last person alluded to is Simon, mind you. "And there followed him (Simon) a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him (Simon)". But Jesus turning unto them said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for your children, &c." This was superfluous, for they did not weep for him but for Simon. "And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary, there they crucified him". Now the last person alluded to is Simon; therefore, it must have been Simon they crucified. "Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do". (A Voice: Is that Simon as well?) No, but Jesus, who shouted out from the crowd, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do", they are crucifying poor Simon and they think it is me. Well, this discussion for the present ends to-night. I thank you kindly for the attention you have given; for, although you have sometimes interrupted me, it still is a great credit to the town of Birmingham that you have at last allowed a Jew to come forward for the first time, to express his opinions publicly whether he is in the right or not. There never was a time when a Jew came forward in England before; and I am sure that out of England no Jew would be allowed to do what I have done here. It shows that we have in England at least arrived at the time when we can tolerate other opinions as well as our own. I will close in the sublime words of one of the finest female writers that ever graced the field of literature and moral philosophy.

“Long have the nations slept—hark to that sound!
The sleep is ended, and the world awakes:
Man rises in his strength, and looks around,
While on his sight the dawn of reason breaks.
Lo! Knowledge draws the curtain from his mind,
Quell’s Fancy’s vision, and his spirit tames
Deep in his breast, that law to seek and find,
Which kings would write in blood, and priests in flames.
Shout, Earth! the creature man, till now the foe
Of thee, and all who tread thy parent breast,
Henceforth, shall learn himself and thee to know,
And in that knowledge shall be wise and blest.”

The meetings closed with a vote of thanks to Mr. Wright for presiding, in response to which he remarked that the whole of the debate had been conducted with even greater decorum than they might have expected from the nature of the subject.

**THE
BRADLAUGH
DEBATE**

**— IS THE BIBLE
DIVINE?**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
PREFACE	95	FOURTH NIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION.	
FIRST NIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION.		Mr. Roberts' first speech	200
Mr. Roberts' first speech	107	Mr. Bradlaugh's first speech	207
Mr. Bradlaugh's first speech	113	Mr. Roberts questions Mr. Bradlaugh ..	212
Mr. Roberts questions Mr. Bradlaugh ..	119	Mr. Bradlaugh questions Mr. Roberts ..	215
Mr. Bradlaugh questions Mr. Roberts ..	123	Mr. Roberts' second speech	217
Mr. Roberts' second speech	127	Mr. Bradlaugh's second speech	221
Mr. Bradlaugh's second speech	131	Mr. Roberts' third speech	223
Mr. Roberts' third speech	135	Mr. Bradlaugh's third speech	227
Mr. Bradlaugh's third speech	135		
SECOND NIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION		FIFTH NIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION	
Mr. Roberts' first speech	137	Mr. Roberts' first speech	230
Mr. Bradlaugh's first speech	143	Mr. Bradlaugh's first speech	235
Mr. Roberts questions Mr. Bradlaugh ..	149	Mr. Roberts questions Mr. Bradlaugh ..	240
Mr. Bradlaugh questions Mr. Roberts ..	154	Mr. Bradlaugh questions Mr. Roberts ..	242
Mr. Roberts' second speech	157	Mr. Roberts' second speech	245
Mr. Bradlaugh's second speech	160	Mr. Bradlaugh's second speech	248
Mr. Roberts' third speech	163	Mr. Roberts' third speech	251
Mr. Bradlaugh's third speech	164	Mr. Bradlaugh's third speech	253
THIRD NIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION.		SIXTH NIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION.	
Mr. Roberts' first speech	166	Mr. Roberts' first speech	255
Mr. Bradlaugh's first speech	173	Mr. Bradlaugh's first speech	259
Mr. Roberts questions Mr. Bradlaugh ..	179	Mr. Roberts questions Mr. Bradlaugh ..	263
Mr. Bradlaugh questions Mr. Roberts ..	183	Mr. Bradlaugh questions Mr. Roberts ..	265
Mr. Roberts' second speech	188	Mr. Roberts' second speech	268
Mr. Bradlaugh's second speech	192	Mr. Bradlaugh's second speech	270
Mr. Roberts' third speech	195	Mr. Roberts' third speech	272
Mr. Bradlaugh's third speech	197	Mr. Bradlaugh's third speech	276

A REVIEW OF THE DISCUSSION.

BY. MR. ROBERTS

INTRODUCTION	278	FOURTH NIGHT	
FIRST NIGHT.		Mr. Roberts' argument	314
Mr. Roberts' argument	279	Mr. Bradlaugh's argument	320
Mr. Bradlaugh's argument	284	FIFTH NIGHT.	
SECOND NIGHT.		Mr. Roberts' argument	326
Mr. Roberts' argument	298	Mr. Bradlaugh's argument	330
Mr. Bradlaugh's argument	299	SIXTH NIGHT.	
THIRD NIGHT.		Mr. Robert's argument	333
Mr. Roberts' argument	309	Mr. Bradlaugh's argument	334
Mr. Bradlaugh's argument	313	CONCLUSION	335

PREFACE.

It is an unusual and unsatisfactory circumstance for a discussion to be divided up into two parts between two separate towns. The reader will naturally be curious to know, not only how the discussion came about, but also how it came to assume this extraordinary and inconvenient shape, from which, however, with the whole discussion in his hands, he will not be a sufferer. His curiosity cannot be more effectually gratified than by placing before him the correspondence which led to the holding of it. It is as follows:

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM,
18th February, 1876.

Mr. CHARLES BRADLAUGH. DEAR SIR.—You may be aware that the desirability of a meeting in debate between yourself and me has been for a considerable time urged by many persons who know us both. I believe the matter was verbally mentioned to you some months ago by Mr. Arthur Andrew, of London; and you were good enough to express your willingness to hold the proposed meeting.

I now write for the purpose of putting the proposal into formal shape. I will undertake, for six nights—spread over two weeks—three successive nights in each week, to affirm that the Scriptures are the authentic and genuine records of Divine revelation. I leave you to choose whether the debate shall be by ordinary speeches, or by the Socratic mode, or a mixture of both, merely expressing my opinion that the latter is, perhaps, on the whole, best calculated to put the matter in debate to a thorough test.

As to the place where the debate should take place, the majority of my friends are in favour of Birmingham. I presume Birmingham will not be unacceptable to you. We should, probably, have a larger audience there than anywhere else.

As to the date, it will probably suit the state of your engagements, as it will mine, if I name a somewhat distant day, say the autumn of the present year; by which time, the Town Hall, Birmingham, will be re-opened after alterations and repairs. The disposal of the surplus, if any, after the payment of expenses, I would leave to your proposal, subject to mutual agreement.

If these proposals are agreeable to you, you could, probably, name a local committee for the execution of arrangements in detail. Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

“THE NATIONAL REFORMER,” 29, TURNER STREET, COMMERCIAL ROAD,
LONDON, E.,
21st February, 1876.

DEAR SIR,—I have handed your letter to Mr. W. H. Holyoak, Belgrave Gate, Leicester, who will write you, and who has my full authority to arrange. Yours respectfully,

C. BRADLAUGH.

Robert Roberts, Esq., 64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham.

45, HUMBERSTONE GATE, LEICESTER,
February 25th, 1876.

To ROBERT ROBERTS, Esq. DEAR SIR,—I write on behalf of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. He has left to me the arrangement of the debate between you and him.

Please consider that it is settled to come off. The time we prefer is during the month of April or the beginning of May.

The place, Leicester Temperance Hall, for say three nights. Mr. B. will not object to three nights in Birmingham as well if you wish. The mode of debate: we assent with you to the mixed, viz., question and answer and ordinary speeches.

We trust you will see your way to this earlier date; for the date you name appears to us so remote, that a thousand events may occur between now and then to prevent its ever taking place. Trusting, however, that you will see your way, and waiting your reply, I am, Sir, yours sincerely,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM,
26th February, 1876.

Mr. HOLYOAK. DEAR SIR.—Thanks for yours of the 25th inst., according to Mr. Bradlaugh’s promise to me.

Your proposals, however, are not quite acceptable in some details. The date is too early. It is a matter of impossibility for me to take part much sooner than the time I mentioned to Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. Collyer, your townsman, will be able to inform you of one reason, sufficient of itself. I admit my time is somewhat remote; but this need not be a disadvantage. As for the uncertainties, they would apply with nearly equal force to an earlier date, and must be submissively encountered.

As to the place, I presume Mr. Bradlaugh can have no personal choice, as his friends will be as numerous in Birmingham as in Leicester; therefore, I must ask

your consent to Birmingham. It would be a great disappointment to the majority of my friends if it were not to take place there, and would, to some extent, frustrate the object I have in view in consenting to encounter a man of Mr. Bradlaugh's calibre and reputation. I can understand your preference for Leicester, and do not quarrel with it. To have the debate there would also be in accordance with the wishes of many in that town whom I should greatly desire to gratify. Nevertheless, the preponderance of reasons from my point of view, is sufficiently in favour of Birmingham to justify me in pressing for it. If you feel it would be conceding an advantage to me, you have also to remember that you can well afford to concede any advantage to one who will figure so small in collision with so popular a man and a cause.

Three nights is an utterly inadequate time for the argument I have to submit. Twelve nights would not be too long. It will be necessary for you to consent to six nights, and these must, of course, be in one place; for it would place both speakers in an awkward position to have a new audience for the second half of the debate.

Regretting my inability to return a simple affirmative to your proposals, and looking for your reply, respectfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

45, HUMBERSTONE GATE,
February 28th, 1876.

To ROBERT ROBERTS, Esq. DEAR SIR.—Yours of the 26th inst., I have forwarded to Mr. Bradlaugh, along with a copy of what follows; not seeing what I can have to do with arranging for a debate to come off in Birmingham.

I should have been pleased to be instrumental in bringing it about in Leicester; but in Birmingham, the Birmingham friends had better be consulted. It seems to me they are the parties to move in the matter, and not I. You will please reply, advising me of your opinion. I am, dear sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

45, HUMBERSTONE GATE,

To ROBERT ROBERTS, Esq. DEAR SIR.—Mr. Bradlaugh writes me as follows:—

“DEAR SIR.—As the challenge was given by Mr. Roberts's friends in Leicester, and as the Leicester friends first asked me to meet Mr. Roberts there, a debate in Leicester must take precedence of any other debate with Mr. Roberts; therefore, I return you his letter, and you had better send a copy of mine to you. I do not mean this as an objection to meet Mr. Roberts in Birmingham; but I do mean that I think it would be a slight on the Leicester Secular Society if I passed that

Town over. I nevertheless leave myself entirely in the hands of the Leicester friends. Yours truly,

C. BRADLAUGH.”

I might say that we in Leicester quite concur with the view Mr. B. takes.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully, WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM.

2nd March, 1876.

Mr. HOLYOAK. DEAR SIR.—I am in receipt of yours, without date, but presumably of to-day.

Mr. Bradlaugh leaves himself entirely in your hands. I cannot quite comprehend why a man of his independence should do this instead of dealing directly with me, and shaping his own course. Nevertheless, he having done so, with you will rest the responsibility of preventing the discussion, if you insist upon a condition needless on your side, and on my side inconsistent with the object of the discussion.

I cannot recognise the claim, or at least the ground of the claim put forward on behalf of Leicester. It is not true that the “challenge” was given by my friends in Leicester. The “challenge” has been given by me, at the instigation of friends in Birmingham, London, Leicester, and other places; and therefore Leicester has nothing to do with fixing the place. Mr. Bradlaugh may have heard of it first at Leicester; but this does not confer the right in question. I named Birmingham in my first letter, pressed for it in my second, and you will pardon me if I insist upon it in my third.

If a second debate should seem desirable to all parties, I promise it shall be in Leicester, so far as I am concerned; but the first encounter must take place in the metropolis of the Midlands.

Mr. Bradlaugh says he has no objection to meet me in Birmingham, and although he says in the beginning of his letter, that Leicester must take the precedence, by the last sentence he leaves the decision with you. To you, therefore, I appeal, to waive the objection and to allow the arrangements for the discussion to proceed. Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

45, HUMBERSTONE GATE, LEICESTER,

3rd March, 1876.

ROBERT ROBERTS, Esq. DEAR SIR—Yours of yesterday is to hand. Mr. Bradlaugh has left the arrangement of bringing about a debate with you in my hands. With the reason why I imagine we are *not* concerned. I take it that what

we have to do with is the fact. And the responsibility you name, I accept. You say, "It is not true that the challenge was given by my friends in Leicester". That, sir, is a positive statement. Let us see upon what basis it rests, and whether that little word *not* is not a mistake on your part. The date of your first to Mr. Bradlaugh is February the 18th, 1876, but on January the 30th, 1876, a gentleman made a statement in the Lecture Hall of the Temperance Hall, Leicester, before a large audience, to the effect that Mr. Roberts *was* prepared to meet either Mr. Holmes or Mr. Bradlaugh in public debate on the question—"Is the Bible true?" I see no reason why I should not give the gentleman's name; it was Mr. Vicars Collyer, who, I believe, is a friend of yours; and with the view of testing that statement, I waited upon him during the week, and on February 4th, I advised Mr. Bradlaugh of the statement publicly made by Mr. V.C.; and Mr. B. replied by saying that he only knew Mr. Roberts as a Christadelphian; that he knew nothing against him, and wished to be informed of the terms of the challenge, and whether he had a respectable committee in Leicester, saying, I shall, probably, be governed by my friends there. How, sir, you can reconcile this by saying "It is not true", I do not see. On that point, I beg to differ from you in thinking that Leicester has nothing to do with it.

To second promises I cannot attend until the first statement be verified. It is with that I have to do, and to that I confine myself. I am, Sir, yours respectfully,
WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM,

4th March, 1876.

Mr. HOLYOAK. DEAR SIR.—The circumstance you mention, which had escaped my memory, explains your view and Mr. Bradlaugh's as to the origin of the challenge. I cannot admit, however, that it gives the real foundation for the facts as they stand.

Mr. Collyer's intimation of my willingness to debate, (which he made of his own motion in response to some challenge from the platform), was merely the declaration of a privately-known fact, and not a challenge in the sense of carrying with it the local obligations now sought to be deduced from it. I was not aware of the incident till after it happened, and it made so little impression on me that I had forgot it. I admit it is open to the construction you and Mr. Bradlaugh have put upon it, and that, therefore, you are free from the imputation you seem to see in my denial; but you must be too experienced in such matters, to confound an unofficial intimation of willingness to debate with the formal thing implied in a "challenge".

The "challenge" is contained in my letter of the 18th ult., and with that as such, my Leicester friends had nothing to do. That challenge, as I said in my last, is the result of the expressed wishes of friends in divers places.

To free the matter from the complications arising from the intervention of third parties, I hereby renew the challenge, to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham for six nights, for the discussion of the subject proposed in my first letter. Yours respectfully,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

45, HUMBERSTONE GATE, LEICESTER,
6th March, 1876.

To ROBERT ROBERTS, Esq. DEAR SIR.—Your acknowledgement of your memory having been refreshed as to the origin of this correspondence, and the contemplated debate between yourself and Mr. C. Bradlaugh, is very honourable to you. And although you cannot admit that we in Leicester have the strongest claim for the debate to take place here, it is satisfactory to know that you do not deny that we in Leicester were the first movers in this matter.

The facts I named in my last I repeat. Mr. V. Collyer said you were prepared to debate, and I with a view of testing that statement, waited upon him to accept and arrange. Ever since I have been trying to bring you and Mr. B. together; but now I begin to fear that my efforts will be fruitless.

I should have been glad if it could have been arranged, but you seem to stick fast to Birmingham, for what reason I cannot tell, but I can tell I have nothing to do with Birmingham, and am not interested in any way of its taking place there.

The facts are very simple; you were either prepared or you were not.

The statement was plain, as plain could be, and now I think we in Leicester cannot be charged with neglecting it; and besides according to your letters you will not be prepared until towards the end of the year. If so, it appears to me that there can be no use in talking about it so very long before-hand. It will be soon enough in September to re-open the correspondence. I am Sir, yours respectfully,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

SEA SIDE,
10th March, 1876

Mr. HOLYOAK. DEAR SIR.—Your letter of the 6th inst. has been forwarded to me from Birmingham, and as it is calculated to create an artificial version of the facts, I cannot refrain from making the following remarks.

1.—I have not acknowledged that “my memory has been refreshed as to the origin of this correspondence, and the contemplated debate”. The refreshment of my memory related to an incident which explained how you could take such a view of the origin of the debate as you did; but which had nothing to do with its

real origin. The origin of the correspondence, is my own letter to Mr. Bradlaugh of the 18th ult. The origin of that letter was of many months' previous date, in conversations at different places. The letter itself contains evidence of this. The second sentence refers to the matter having been mentioned months before, by Mr. A. Andrew of London. I have merely been waiting for such prospects of health as would justify me in venturing upon the strain of a debate with Mr. Bradlaugh.

Please, therefore, to understand that my acknowledgement of refreshment of memory refers to the origin of your misconception, and not to the origin of the proposed debate; also that I do deny that you in Leicester were the first movers in the matter. I am the first mover in the matter, as the result of the suggestions spread over a considerable antecedent period. You have come to consider yourselves as the first movers, by an incident which I have admitted excuses you; but which I deny constitutes the origin of the matter.

2.—It strikes me as somewhat absurd, for you to talk of ineffectual attempts to bring Mr. Bradlaugh and me together, seeing that I have offered to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham, and that Mr. Bradlaugh has left it with you to decide whether the meeting shall be there or not. You have simply to decide to bring us together in Birmingham, and the thing is done. Your saying you have nothing to do with Birmingham, does not dispose of the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh has left the decision in your hands.

3.—The facts are, as you say, exceedingly simple. I am prepared to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham and have sent him a proposal to that effect. Mr. Bradlaugh says he leaves it with you, and you interpose yourself as an obstacle. If I could be sure you are in this acting by Mr. Bradlaugh's instructions, I should be tempted to doubt Mr. Bradlaugh's reputation for courage; but having no evidence that it is so, I refrain from drawing a conclusion.

4.—The lateness of the date proposed by me, is no reason for deferring the decision. That lateness is a necessity, apart from the condition of my health. My engagements are generally filled-up six months in advance; and if we don't arrange now, it will be difficult for me to arrange at the time you mention. Another consideration is, that the Birmingham Town Hall is so well occupied that we should stand a poor chance of engaging it, unless we did so several months ahead.

But you say you "have nothing to do with Birmingham." Consequently, early or late, we could have no object in re-opening the correspondence with reference to a discussion to take place in that town. I must, therefore, appeal direct to Mr. Bradlaugh, which I do by this post.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

SEA SIDE,
10th March, 1876.

Mr. BRADLAUGH. DEAR SIR.—In a final letter forwarded from Birmingham, Mr. Holyoak writes me that he has nothing to do with Birmingham, and no interest in the discussion taking place there. This compels me to appeal direct to yourself in the matter.

My proposal for the debate with you had reference to Birmingham, and I must ask you to nominate some gentleman in that place who will be interested in forwarding arrangements on your behalf; unless you would prefer to communicate directly with me yourself, which would be more satisfactory. Yours respectfully,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

HUMBERSTONE GATE, LEICESTER,
19th March, 1876.

ROBERT ROBERTS, Esq. DEAR SIR.—Mr. Bradlaugh has forwarded me your letter of the 10th inst. And lest you should deem me wanting in courtesy, I acknowledge yours of the 10th inst. to myself, and in doing so, take the opportunity of reviewing the case as it stands, or as it appears to me.

I was anxious, upon hearing it announced publicly before a large audience here “that you were prepared to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in public debate, upon the question, ‘Is the Bible true?’ ” to bring about such debate if possible, and I waited upon the gentleman who made the announcement, for that purpose. This, sir, I take to be the first action in this matter. This was in January, and on the 31st Mr. B. communicated to me his consent.

Your first letter upon the subject bears date February 18th, in which you state in reference to the place where the debate should take place, “the majority of my friends would prefer Birmingham: I presume this would not be objectionable to you, but in this you will speak your mind.” Mr. Bradlaugh has spoken his mind — and having left the matter in my hands, I — being the first who communicated with him upon the subject, do most decidedly object to your presumption in fixing upon Birmingham.

I acknowledge that I may — and I think rightly — be an “obstacle” in the way of the debate taking place in any town, until we have had the satisfaction or opportunity of hearing it in the town where the announcement was made. If anything can be done towards this end, I will willingly work. If not I will have nothing to do with it, and can only conclude that you were not prepared. But if you say “I shall be prepared between now and the end of the year to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Leicester”, I will consider it settled, and shall be glad to be informed thereof. I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

SEA SIDE,
24th March, 1876.

Mr. HOLYOAK. DEAR SIR.—Yours is forwarded to me. I have already expressed my mind on the contents of your note. Having nothing to add, our correspondence must now close.

I address Mr. Bradlaugh direct by this post. Respectfully yours,
ROBERT ROBERTS.

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM,
25th March, 1876.

Mr. BRADLAUGH. DEAR SIR.—I pray you to pardon me for troubling you again but it seems necessary.

My correspondence with Mr. Holyoak has become inextricably complicated by the unofficial action of one of my friends having associated Leicester with my proposal of debate with you. I have, therefore, closed the correspondence, and begin *de novo*, by placing directly before you the proposal I make, which I beg the favour of your accepting or declining directly to myself as the laws of courtesy required.

I offer to meet you in Birmingham for six nights, in support of the affirmation that the Bible is the authentic and reliable record of Divine revelation.

Until you accept the proposal in this general form, I need not say more, but remain, Yours respectfully,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

P.S.—I am at the sea-side, at this writing, but head my letter with my permanent address, which will always find me.

To this letter no answer was received.

The following note meanwhile appeared on the cover of the *Christadelphian*. It is re-published here as representing Mr. Roberts' reason for pressing for Birmingham.

“S.—The discussion with Bradlaugh seems likely to fall through owing to that gentleman's refusal, by his agent, Mr. Holyoak, to hold the discussion in Birmingham. He insists on Leicester, where his friends are numerous. This interposes a barrier on our part, since one principal object in consenting to challenge Bradlaugh was to make a discussion with him useful in delivering the truth from the imputation of infidelity, in a town where the truth is better known than in any other, as the result of many years' proclamation, but in which nevertheless, it has that prejudice to encounter. A discussion with Bradlaugh would be a great effort

for our peculiar physical liabilities; and we should not feel justified in venturing upon it without some commensurate object such as we have mentioned. In any other town but Birmingham, unless it be London, we should fail to realise sufficient incentive; for we have no hope of benefiting the class of minds who have embraced Secularism. Our aim would be to serve the truth. Having to serve it in many ways, we cannot afford to incur the physical risk of an encounter with Bradlaugh without a tangible prospect of good service. Hence our proposal for Birmingham, which Mr. Holyoak declines. If the proposal fall through, we may publish the correspondence”.

The following note appeared in the *National Reformer*, of March 26th, among “Answers to Correspondents.”

“R. Roberts, Birmingham.—Having in consequence of the action of your own friend placed the matter in the hands of the Leicester Secular Society, we decline to withdraw our authority. Our health does not permit us to engage personally in a lengthy correspondence.”

To this, the following answer was sent:—

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM,
6th April, 1876.

MR. BRADLAUGH. DEAR SIR.—I have only seen for the first time to-day your note in the *National Reformer*, in answer to my letter. I am not a reader of the *Reformer*, but a friend has handed me the issue of March 26th, containing the note in question.

I write to say that I do not propose a correspondence, lengthy or otherwise. I wish you merely to say “Yes” or “No”; will you meet me for a six nights’ debate in Birmingham or London on the subject named? Your friends in Birmingham can arrange the details. Awaiting your answer, respectfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

To this letter, Mr. Bradlaugh sent no reply, but inserted the following note in the *Reformer*.—“R. Roberts, Birmingham.—We really cannot take the matter out of the hands of the Leicester Secular Society.”

Mr. Bradlaugh was advertised to lecture in Birmingham on Sunday, April 9th. On that date, Mr. F. Hodgkinson of Peterboro’, visiting Birmingham, and observing the fact, expressed a curiosity to see and hear Mr. Bradlaugh. This led to conversation which resulted in a proposal, accepted by Mr. Hodgkinson, that he should attend Mr. Bradlaugh’s meeting, and if an opportunity offered, propose a

six nights' discussion in Birmingham. Mr. Hodgkinson did so, and at the close of the meeting, being invited to the platform, he read the following written authority:

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM.

9th April, 1876.

I hereby authorise Mr. Frank Hodgkinson, the bearer of this note, to state in Mr. Bradlaugh's meeting this afternoon, that I am willing to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham for six night's debate on the subject:

“Are the Scriptures the Authentic and Reliable Records of Divine Revelation?”

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Mr. Bradlaugh said the challenge having first been delivered in Leicester, he was in duty bound not to disappoint the people there; but he was willing to make this compromise — to have two nights in Leicester and four nights in Birmingham. After the meeting, Mr. Hodgkinson communicated with Mr. Roberts, and sent the following letter to Mr. Bradlaugh, having it placed, by a messenger, in the hands of the chairman of Mr. Bradlaugh's evening meeting, the same day.

64, BELGRAVE ROAD, BIRMINGHAM.

9th April, 1876

C. BRADLAUGH, Esq. DEAR SIR.—Mr. Roberts accepts your compromise, but with regret that you insist upon a division. Will you inform Mr. Holyoak, and also appoint someone here with whom the arrangements in detail can be made for the two nights in Leicester and four nights in Birmingham? Mr. Roberts accedes to this plan reluctantly, but submits rather than the discussion should fall through. Please reply to me at “Norman Cross, Peterborough”.

Yours truly,

FRANK HODGKINSON.

“THE NATIONAL REFORMER,” 29, TURNER STREET,
COMMERCIAL ROAD, LONDON, E.

10th April, 1876.

FRANK HODGKINSON, Esq. DEAR SIR.—Mine is not a compromise; it is an insistence of right. I did not challenge at Leicester; I was challenged there. Mr. W.H. Holyoak will arrange for the two nights' debate at Leicester, and when the dates for these are fixed, Mr. C.C. Cattell, 29, Snow Hill, Birmingham, will be authorised by me to arrange for four further nights at Birmingham. One thing tell Mr. Roberts, that I cannot have a long date. I am ready to debate in May, June, or July. If Mr. Roberts is engaged for these months let him renew his challenge later. I always make lectures give way to debates, but I will not fix a far off date as I might find it bind me inconveniently.

Any further correspondence please address to W.H. Holyoak, as I have not the leisure to make any personal arrangements. Yours sincerely,

C. BRADLAUGH.

Forwarded by W.H. Holyoak, 45, Humberstone Gate, Leicester.

On the receipt of this letter, Mr. Hodgkinson and Mr. Bradlaugh's agents went to work, and arrangements were finally made for the holding of the discussion, in the Temperance Halls of Leicester and Birmingham, on June 13th, 14th, 15th; 20th, 21st and 22nd.

The discussion was largely attended throughout. The report is from the notes of short-hand writers who were engaged for the discussion — revised by the speakers.

Towards the close of the discussion Mr. Bradlaugh sold his interest in the report to Mr. Hodgkinson, who now publishes the same, in conjunction with Mr. Roberts, who avails himself of the opportunity thus secured, of adding a review of the discussion, for the notice of some things in Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches there was no time to notice during the discussion, and for the supply of some things on the affirmative side, he was obliged from the same cause to omit. That the cause of impartiality may not suffer, Mr. Roberts will offer Mr. Bradlaugh the opportunity of writing a rejoinder to his review, for publication in the same pamphlet.

Readers will be in a better position to judge of the debate than hearers. Mr. Bradlaugh's loud voice and animated delivery, made an impression which it may be found his arguments fail to sustain. On the other hand, the arguments on behalf of the Bible may be found to have more weight than they seemed to have in the heat of controversy.

The issue debated is the most important of the questions that engage public attention. The discussion is published, not as an exhaustive, or even a moderately thorough canvass of the subject, but merely as a passing contribution to its consideration, which may help to draw to the subject some of the attention which it ought to receive at the hands of rational men.

Birmingham, 27th June, 1876.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

SIX NIGHTS' DISCUSSION.

First Night,

TUESDAY, 13th JUNE, 1876,

IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL, LEICESTER.

THE CHAIR WAS OCCUPIED BY MR. W. STANYON OF LEICESTER.

THE CHAIRMAN having stated the order of proceedings, and asked the meeting to restrain the manifestation of their feelings, he called upon Mr. Roberts to open the Debate.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I would not have been so bold as to encounter a man of Mr. Bradlaugh's ability had it not been for two things — a persuasion of the invulnerable strength of the cause which I have to maintain this evening, and a deep sense of the unspeakable consequence of the matter to be debated; and perhaps I ought to add a third — a conception of the duty that rests upon everybody holding the convictions which I represent, to avail themselves of every opportunity of impressing those convictions upon others. With regard to the first of these points, there may, probably, be a great many here present who will not agree with me; with regard to the second, I should scarcely think there can be present one who will say that it is unimportant whether or no there be a hope of a better life for mankind than they have now, whether there is or is not ever to be a better state of things upon the earth than there is at the present time. I will not waste much time in discussing that point: all will agree that the question is one of vital moment, and, if my side of the question be the right one, then we have a good matter to realise — a matter so good as to justify the rapturous exclamation which we find in the Scriptures, "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace!" while, if the position represented by Mr. Bradlaugh be the right one, the skull, cross-bones, coffins, dust, corruption, despair, brood over the entire prospects of every man who has ever lived upon earth, or ever will live. The real question to which I have to address myself is the first one — the question as to whether or no the position I represent, be of the invulnerable strength which I assert it to be; and upon that I feel no quailing. There is no test that can be applied to the Scriptures but will yield the one result which I shall seek to make manifest to your understanding, whether we regard it in the light of the circumstances that ought to exist in the world if the Bible be true; or with respect to the historic harmony that ought to subsist between this book, if it

be true, and the records of mankind; or in the light of its intrinsic character; whether we consider the character of its histories; whether we consider the nature of its prophecies in relation to the accomplished history of man; whether we consider it with regard to the sentiment that animates it from beginning to end, we cannot fail, by a logical construction of the facts of the case, to arrive at the conclusion that the Bible is no human production. Upon all these points I have every confidence in being able to make manifest the justice of my contention — that is, that these Scriptures are the authentic and the reliable records of Divine revelation.

But we must proceed by stages. I have but one fear — and perhaps before the discussion is concluded you will see how well-founded that fear is — that I shall be unable to crowd into a six nights' debate the host of arguments, the mass of evidence, which I can adduce in support of the proposition which I stand here to affirm. I must be content to do what is possible, and, in a hurried, condensed, and sketchy way, to rehearse before you the reasons, which I am convinced must be regarded as conclusive in favour of my affirmation by any logical mind acquainted with all the facts, and taking time enough, under a sense of the importance characterising the subject, to consider those facts. I shall divide the argument into six sections, corresponding with the six nights during which we shall be together. I shall contend to-night that the state of affairs now existing in the world is in harmony with the view that the Bible is the Word of God, and inconsistent with the notion that it is the production of ignorant and fanatical men. Further, to-night I will try to show that, if there is a book circulating among men whose authenticity can be demonstrated, it is this entire volume. I confine not my remarks to the writings of the apostles. I apply it also to the writings of the prophets and Moses himself, notwithstanding all the perverse erudition that has been brought to bear in our age to try to displace Moses from the confidence of the people. But I will say, and perhaps ought to say, before proceeding, that while entertaining that strong view, there is some pity to be entertained for men in Mr. Bradlaugh's position, because there are circumstances that justify, or appear upon the surface to justify, the conclusion to which they have come. There is a dark, a corrupt, an inhuman, a degraded, a dreadful, history to look back upon during the past eighteen centuries, and, if you make the Bible responsible for that history, you have a good argument against it; but it will not require a very extensive argument to show that there is no connection between the corruptions of Papal domination in Europe and these holy oracles. There is also extant in the world, and established under many circumstances of influence and importance, a set of doctrines which, if true — which, if the teaching of the Bible, I grant would also constitute a difficulty in receiving them, and might justify the unbelievers in the position which they have assumed. I will then, on the second night — which will be to-morrow night — contend that the unquestionable facts connected with the establishment of Christianity in the world in the first century, including the history and the character of Christ, are incapable of being explained on any rational principle, if Christ did not rise from the dead, and if the apostles were impostors.

On the third night I will contend that the single case of the apostle Paul, when all the facts of his unimpeachable history are distinctly realised and logically construed, is sufficient of itself to prove the divinity of Christ, and, therefore, of the whole of the Scriptures of which the record of his case constitutes a part. On the fourth night I will contend that the literary and moral peculiarities of the Bible, the character of its sentiments, so entirely alien to the universal tendencies of human nature, Jew and Gentile; its clear, chaste, vigorous, and concise diction; its agreement one part with another throughout, notwithstanding the great intervals of time at which its different parts were composed; its perfectly artless candour in the record of facts, irrespective of the bearing of those facts for or against its main contention, are totally at variance with the supposition that the book is the production of ignorant and designing men, and proves that its production is due to that divine guidance and initiative in the writers to which both Paul and Peter, and others as well, attribute it. On the fifth night I will contend that the history of the Jewish race, particularly as involving the character and career of Moses, cannot be explained on the Freethinker's hypothesis of the Bible; but, on the contrary, is an irrefragable proof of its Divine character and authorship. On the last night I will contend that the prophecies of the Bible — so explicit, so sober, so useful in their character, being in this respect so unlike the vague, incoherent, irrational predictions of the Greek augurs and other contemporary pretenders — are an evidence of the divinity of the authorship of the Bible, an evidence which becomes simply overwhelming when we consider their fulfilment in the accomplished history of mankind.

I am not about to deny that there are difficulties; I will not deny that there are obscurities; but I do contend that those difficulties, and those obscurities, are not inconsistent with the main conclusion deducible from those extensive premisses which I have indicated in that synopsis of the argument for this six nights' debate. I contend that those are rather in the nature of the apparent inconsistencies which arise in all cases, and in every matter, for there is no argument, there is no question, there is no character, there is no book, there is no case, in connection with which a hostile ingenuity is not able to create apparent discrepancies, and to lay hold of, perhaps, real discrepancies on the surface, and to make an apparently successful use of them in an antagonistic sense; but I will admit this, that in all true cases the apparent anomalies, and contradictions, and discrepancies, ought to be capable of reconciliation with the main drift of the proof. In fact, this is the sort of test in every case that comes before a court of law. There are always two sides to every case, and, when argued by capable men, the argument on each side is so plausible as to bewilder the jury and disqualify them for coming to a confident conclusion; but a judicial analysis of the evidence, is able to point out that the positive proof points one way, and that the other, which points in the opposite way, can be explained in harmony with the positive evidence, though it may appear to be in contradiction to it; whereas, the other side of the question, when sifted in the same judicial and impartial manner by the judge, cannot be so explained or reconciled in harmony with the bulk of the evidence. And that is the

nature of the case to-night, and throughout this entire debate, that the positive evidence is all one way. There are points of difficulty and there are obscurities, but there are no points of difficulty, there are no obscurities, which I am afraid to face. There are things which appear to be difficulties, but which, nevertheless, disappear upon a thorough examination.

I will begin the argument to-night, that is to say, at the point at which we now stand — 1876. If the Bible is true, there ought to be Jews; if the Bible is true, there ought to be a corrupt Christianity as the basis of the political system of Europe. If Mr. Bradlaugh should afterwards ask me to prove these two propositions, I will; but, meanwhile, I will take them for granted: they are so self-evident to those who know the Scriptures; and, therefore, I will simply ask, Are there Jews? Is there a political Christianity in the world? With regard to the first item, at all events, no one will hesitate in the answer; the Jews exist everywhere throughout the world, in all civilised countries. You will see the importance of that point if you consider with what pointed effect Mr. Bradlaugh might have asked this question; had there been no Jews, he might have said: "In the prophecies of Jeremiah it is said, God will never make an end of the Jewish nation;" and he might have said, Where are the Jews?" The Bible does say that, and there the Jews are. So far, therefore, I contend that the state of facts is in harmony with the hypothesis that the Bible is true. And I will also contend that the continued existence of the Jewish race under the terrible circumstances which have characterised their history during the past 1,800 years was a greatly improbable thing; that a race without national organisation, without a capital, and scattered among every nation under heaven, should have continued to retain its racial identity, what a highly improbable thing! The existence of corrupt Christianity, foretold in the Scriptures, is the great fact in the European system of the present day, for what is the most conspicuous feature of that system but the one against which Mr. Bradlaugh, and many others in this country, are now directing their energies — the union of Church and State? They are aiming to procure the separation of Church and State. Why, that very endeavour is evidence of the correspondence between the theory of the Bible's truth and the existing state of facts, in so far as the Bible's prophecies require such a system to exist in the present day. We may at a later stage of the discussion, have to look at this matter a little more closely; but meanwhile, it is sufficient as a starting point to show that the existing state of things in the world is such as it ought to be on the hypothesis of the Bible being the Word of God.

Let us now go backwards, and ask whether there is evidence of the authenticity of these books; and I will take the last part of the Bible in the first part of the argument, because, if I establish the argument with regard to the last part, I establish it with regard to the first, though I will argue the first also upon its separate merits. The writings of the apostles: are they the writings of the apostles? I do not know exactly what position Mr. Bradlaugh will take upon this question; and, therefore, so far as he is concerned, I must argue somewhat in the dark; but nevertheless,

with regard to the main question, there need be no difficulty; and there is none. The evidence is so extensive upon the point, that it is difficult to condense it into the few sentences that remain of my half-hour. Nevertheless, it is capable of being condensed in a forcible manner. I will not waste time in arguing that the Bible was not produced last century, or a thousand years ago. Mr. Bradlaugh — or, at all events, the party he represents — have abandoned their first theory of the question, that is to say they now no longer contend that the Bible is a monkish production of the fourth and fifth centuries, for literary labours have exhumed book after book, document after document, and the investigation of them has been conducted with such complete effect as to dissipate the possibility of such a theory being sustained, and to prove that the second part of the Bible was produced in the beginning of the Christian era, and the first part in the ages antecedent to that, at the several times at which it professes to have been produced. Let me give you a specimen of the kind of evidence I am referring to. There are the writings of Tertullian, a writer of the second century. In the middle of the second century, he takes cognisance of the fact that these books were in circulation at that time, under the several names which they now bear, and among the people to whom they purport to have been originally addressed. He says:

“Come now, thou who desirest better to exercise thy curiosity in that which relates to thy salvation. Go through the apostolic churches, in which the chairs of the apostles preside in their places, in which their authentic letters are recited, resounding the voice and representing the face of each one. Is Achaia near thee? thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast Thessalonica. If thou canst direct thy course into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome, whence authority is ready at hand for us also.”

Now, that takes you back to the middle of the second century — that is to say, if you credit Tertullian, as I presume you will, for I do not suppose that Mr. Bradlaugh will call in question the authenticity of that deliverance of Tertullian written in the second century; I say that it takes us back to that period of time from which we look back to an even earlier time, when it was a matter of common notoriety that there were present at Philippi, Corinth, and other cities, where they were then in circulation, letters of Paul which were at that time recognised as having been written by Paul. But we can go further back than that, for there is a genuine letter extant of one Clement of Rome, who is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to have been the first Pope; we need not consider that, because Clement did not consider himself a Pope, and he was not one. But he wrote a letter to the Corinthian Church. These were troublous times for those who professed the faith of Christ; it subjected them to all the evils to which men can possibly be subjected; and the Corinthians, suffering also from disagreements amongst themselves, wrote to Clement of Rome, the Clement referred to by Paul in his letter to the Romans, asking his advice how they should do. Now, in his letter — which I have with me here, if it be at all doubted, and I think the date of

this letter of Clement's is somewhere about the end of the first century; I do not remember the year exactly, but it was before the century was out — he says to the Corinthians, “Ye have Paul's letter; ye know what he says there”, and he also makes a quotation from the letter to the Romans, which Paul addressed to that community. That is to say, within forty years of the time that Paul is alleged to have written the letters, these documents are, by the evidence I am now adducing, proved to have been in circulation amongst those to whom they profess to have been written, and to have been owned by them as the production of the apostle Paul. Now, the force of that argument will be very apparent to those who are acquainted with the nature of the epistle to the Corinthians particularly, for it is a document in which Paul does not speak very complimentarily about them. In it, he tells them they are carnal and walking as men.—(1 Cor. 3:3.) He says to them in 1st Corinthians 11:22: “What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.” And in his second epistle to the same Church he speaks to them in the same terms of disagreeable admonition: “Have I committed an offence in abasing myself that ye [Corinthians] might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely? I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service. And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man; for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied; and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself.”—(2 Corinthians 11:7-9). Now, the fact that a letter to a community that is condemned in it is still owned by that community as an authentic document, written to them by the alleged writer, is the strongest proof that it is authentic. Imagine a parallel case: suppose Mr. Bradlaugh writes a letter to some Secularist Society, blowing them up for some course they are taking, and they treasure this letter amongst their archives as a thing precious to be preserved, and forty years afterwards it is found in their hands, every member of them consenting to the proposition that that was Mr. Bradlaugh's letter; would that not be evidence of the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh had written it? This is the kind of evidence that exists in this particular case, as applicable not only to this letter to the Corinthians, but to the other letters of the apostles. The authenticity of the Four Gospels is proved in the same way. I think it is Justin Martyr, in a book addressed to the Roman Emperor of the day, in his *Apology* for Christianity, that alludes to them in a form of speech, which clearly identifies the Four Gospels as being that to which he is alluding. Origen, I think, also alludes to the Four Gospels. There are other contemporary allusions of the same description, which I refer to merely to show this — that the gospels have a sufficient contemporary recognition to commend them to our confidence, so far as such recognition can do so; for when we come to the merits of the thing itself, when we come to look into the constitution of the New Testament, we do not require any outside evidence whatever. I require it not for my own individual conviction, but nevertheless people are generally more susceptible to impression

from these foreign sources than from the nature of the thing itself. The allusions I am now referring to are evidence that in the beginning of the Christian era the letters of Paul and the Four Gospels were in circulation amongst those who knew whether or no they were authentic documents.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: The proposition which Mr. Roberts has undertaken to prove in this debate is, that "the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation"; and, so far as this debate is concerned, you have nothing whatever to do with what persons of Mr. Bradlaugh's class may have urged at some other time, the more especially as there would be probably great difference of opinion as to who were the proper people to put in under that designation, and we should only be entering into a collateral debate, which would have nothing to do with the real question at issue. I will ask Mr. Roberts to be kind enough, in every text he quotes, to give me chapter and verse, because it will be convenient both to myself and to the audience. We have only had one loose reference to Jeremiah, and I have been wandering a little through the book, finding some things, perhaps, Mr. Roberts won't think applicable, but which I shall have to use, if they suit me, in the course of this debate. Then I ask him also, if he quotes an author outside the Bible, to be good enough not to say "about" the time he lived, because on that we shall have great difference of opinion, but to state the time he thinks he did live, and the authorities upon which he bases that statement, because it is for him to produce his witnesses, and for him to verify them. Next I will ask him when he says Justin Martyr says this, or Origen says that, to be kind enough to refer me to the particular work, to the particular book, to the particular chapter, and, if it have sections, to the particular section; and, if it be a book that don't happen to be translated in English, to the particular version, because there will be a misfortune about some of his witnesses, that they don't always say the same things in different versions and languages; and, if he is right in his representation of Justin Martyr, I am most unfortunate, because no edition of Justin Martyr I have ever read has got a solitary word capable of the construction he has put upon it. Of course, it is possible that Mr. Roberts may quote to me some particular book of Justin Martyr's that I have overlooked, and it would be my duty to look it up in such a case; but if he simply uses round words, without giving express statements, I must say that his witnesses are too general even to be touched; and, when he talks of "contemporary writers," will he permit me to suggest that Clement of Rome, Origen, and Justin Martyr are very awkward instances of contemporary authors? Now, these are only little points; but still, if we understand what we mean about them as we go along, it will very much clear the way. Now the burden of the proof lies upon Mr. Roberts. He has not told us — although what he has undertaken to prove is that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation — even what he means by the Scriptures. I shall assume, for the purpose of this debate, that he means the

ordinary authorised English version, beginning with the Book of Genesis, and ending with the Book of Revelation; and supposing that should not happen to be right — because it may turn out to be wrong — then I will ask my antagonist, Mr. Roberts, to kindly explain to us what he means; and, if he means anything else but this, why he means something else, and why we are to reject this version, and why we should take something else. I heard him say something about “perverse erudition”, but as I make no pretensions to special learning, I shall, therefore, try to confine myself as nearly as I can to authors that are entirely within the reach of all of us; but I ask Mr. Roberts not to refrain, on account of my ignorance, from going to any learned author he likes. It is my duty to be prepared to examine every witness he offers. Then having assumed that those (pointing to the English Bible) are the Scriptures, I will ask what is meant — because he did not tell us — by the words “Divine Revelation”, and I may say at once that I have never contended, that I do not contend, and I do not know any decently-educated man who does contend, that the whole of this Bible is the work either of “ignorant and fanatical” men, or, to use his other phrase, of “ignorant and designing” men. On the contrary, the contention that I should submit to you would be that the Bible, like many other books, is a collection of the works of different men in different ages, many of the earlier books in it being simply collections of, or collections founded on the works of still earlier writers, differing with the ages out of which they grew and with the men whose ideas more or less accurately we get in some of them; added to, curtailed, interlined, abbreviated, augmented, according to the fashions and whims and myths and superstitions of the different ages through which they have come down to us; and I do not pretend that at any particular date some class of ignorant and designing men forged a whole book, which they called the Bible, for the purpose of deceiving the people; such would simply be an absurd contention. If Mr. Roberts will address himself to the proving what lies on him, and not to the answering of what I do not urge, it will save a great deal of time. Now, the question assumes the existence of a Deity capable of making a revelation; and if I were not content, for the purpose of this debate, to assume this, I should not be here; but, as I happen to be an Atheist — although for the purposes of this debate I am quite content to assume a divinity capable of making a revelation — it is necessary I should be told what attributes are claimed for that Deity. Now, Mr. Roberts has refrained from saying a word on that subject. While he alleges that it is Divine revelation, he has not told us what he means by “Divinity”, and clearly all people do not agree on that; the Mahomedans and Buddhists have a different view from Mr. Roberts. It is not simply myself, but out of the fourteen hundred millions of people in the world, probably thirteen hundred millions, and some ninety-nine millions and a few odd thousands, would have a different view from that put forward by Mr. Roberts, so that it is necessary that he should tell us what attributes he attributes to the Deity; and I shall, for the purpose of this debate, attribute to the Deity the following attributes; and if Mr. Roberts objects to any of them, he is perfectly entitled to strike any of them out if

he will kindly say why, and give you the attributes he prefers — omnipotence, all-goodness, omnipresence, omniscience, including in this foreknowledge, immutability, infinity, eternity, personality. Now, if any of those attributes are objectionable, I shall be glad to hear Mr. Roberts strike out those he thinks wrong. I should not have ventured to state them at all if Mr. Roberts had fulfilled his duty at the commencement. And then I say, that the book cannot be a divine revelation which in any of its contents contradicts any of those attributes. I say, if I find within the four corners of this book anything contradicting specifically any one of those attributes, I say that then the book as a whole — because it is as a whole that we are dealing with it — ceases to be capable of proof by Mr. Roberts as the divine revelation he pretends. I am not using the word “pretend” in any unfair sense, but simply as meaning the contention he is bound to maintain. Then I say that a divine revelation ought not to be self-contradictory, and if in addition, or if, having failed in showing that it contradicts the attributes, I show that the book is in any portion of it self-contradictory, I say that then I destroy its claim to be considered a divine revelation. Now, on this, it is possible that the contention Mr. Roberts foreshadowed may arise. He says he will admit, if I understood him rightly, that hostile ingenuity may perhaps lay hold of real contradictions on the surface. Well, now, I should submit to you that, *prima facie*, that book cannot be a revelation from God to man, from which hostile ingenuity to a simple mind may show what would be by that hostile ingenuity sufficient contradiction to compel the simple mind to reject it; I say that it ought not to need the acute brain of a gentleman like Mr. Roberts to explain God’s revelation; that God Himself ought to have made it quite clear if He intended its reception, and that there ought not to be any contradictions either on the surface or anywhere else. Well, then, I submit to you that contradiction on the surface is a contradiction, and that adding the words “on the surface” do not make it any less a contradiction; and, then, if I should be told that that simply means that it is a contradiction on the surface of the English, but if you go to some other language it is to be explained away, then I will ask Mr. Roberts whether any sort of penalty attaches in his mind to the reception or rejection of divine revelation, and, if so, in what language the penalty is going to be inflicted? because it is extremely awkward; take it that there are in the world some eighty millions of people, in round numbers, speaking English; supposing it requires a knowledge of some other language instead of English to comprehend the revelation, and to get rid of the inconsistencies, it is extremely awkward for those who have been born to speak English, and that would of itself seem a fatal objection against the possibility of the book being a revelation; that God should have sent it in one language, while He requires it to be believed in another. And I will ask Mr. Roberts also to tell us — because he has, although telling us to-night he should deal with the present time, he has gone 1,600 or 1,700 years back in a jump—I will ask him to tell us, for my guidance, what he considers to be the original language of each of the books; the date at which he considers each of the books respectively to have been revealed, and to whom, and the evidence in support of each of those propositions. Then I will urge to you,

supposing we get over those little points, that a Divine revelation ought not to be inconsistent with itself, and ought not to be inconsistent with science, and that such inconsistencies exist will be the case that I shall try to make out. Now, in the speech which we have just listened to, there are one or two points, not of argument, because it appears to me that my friend had overlooked, so far as the opening speech was concerned, what was the subject of debate. He addressed some few words, which might have been appropriate (supposing they had been substantiated) to the question. Did the Four Gospels and the writings of the apostles exist in the second century? But I heard nothing that was appropriate to anything else, and that would only be a very limited stage of the inquiry. He said something about "If Mr. Bradlaugh's views be correct, skull, crossbones, and corruption brood over everybody". Well, now, that solemn absurdity scarcely frightened me. At first I did not know which of my views Mr. Roberts was referring to, for I have expressed views on a great many subjects. I have some views on politics, I have some views on political economy, and it did occur to me that what we were to debate was, not what are Mr. Bradlaugh's views in general, but the proposition: "Are the Scriptures the Authentic and Reliable Records of Divine Revelation?" So that although the skull, and crossbones, and corruption, may have some remote reference to Mr. Bradlaugh's views when they are under debate, I will submit to you the only views of Mr. Bradlaugh that Mr. Roberts has a right to deal with in his discussion, are those I put forward on this platform, and no others. Mr. Roberts has been good enough to state, and I thank him for the frankness of the admission, that there should be historic harmony, if the Bible be true, between records purporting to be historic in this book, and the records, so far as we can get them, of humanity; and I shall ask Mr. Roberts to show that there is such harmony especially in relation to the records of the Egyptians; and I will ask him whether it is not admitted, by nearly every person with a pretence to scholarship, that the Hebrew chronology is so sadly deficient that it does not make allowance within many centuries for the period necessary for verified Egyptian civilization. This is one point to which I will ask Mr. Roberts to direct his attention. Then Mr. Roberts appeals to the sentiment which, he says, animates the book from beginning to end. Will he kindly tell me what that sentiment is, for I avow I do not know. I am ready to show that there are, at least, fifty contradictory sentiments. I will show you a sentiment of mercy, a sentiment of cruelty, a sentiment of love, a sentiment of hatred, a sentiment of freedom, a sentiment of slavery, a sentiment in favour of monarchy, and a sentiment against it; and I ask, therefore, for some kind of clue to what Mr. Roberts means. I do not pretend that he has not got a clear meaning in his own mind; I only want to know what it is, so that I may fairly reply to it. Mr. Roberts says that his reasons are such as ought to convince any logical mind. Well, that is a great comfort, because there are certainly some logical minds in the audience, and when we hear the reasons, you will be able to judge them. And then he occupied some time about what he was going to do during the six nights. I shall confine myself to that alone to-night,

because it will save us a considerable waste of time; and what he undertook to prove to-night was that the state of affairs now existing in the world is consistent with the view that the Bible is a revelation from God, and not the work of ignorant and fanatical men. Now, I do not contend it is the work of ignorant and fanatical men. And, next I contend that the whole of the rest is utterly irrelevant until Mr. Roberts has explained to us what he means by divine revelation, and all about it. Then Mr. Roberts says there is some pity to be felt for me in my position. Well, now that is very kind. I always like a nice feeling to exist with anybody with whom I come in contact. It is the first time I have met with Mr. Roberts. Pity is akin to love, and no one knows but what the extension of the feeling of pity may so influence him that he may become a member of the National Secular Society. But an ounce of evidence is worth two tons of pity, and we have not yet had the ounce. And then he says that certain things are not explicable on the Freethinker's hypothesis. It will be time enough for Mr. Roberts to take the Freethinker's hypothesis from me in this debate, and not manufacture a man of straw for the purpose of killing it; it will save a great waste of time. Then he urges that there are difficulties and obscurities which may exist. "Difficulties and obscurities" in God's revelation to human kind! Could God have prevented those difficulties and obscurities, and made them clearer, or could He not? And, then, I will also ask him, so that I may not be misled, chapter and verse, to kindly give me a list of the difficulties and obscurities. I will then not need to press upon them at all. I am sure, with that frankness which characterises every one who wants to believe in the Bible as a Divine revelation, now that Mr. Roberts has told you there are difficulties and obscurities, he will have no hesitation in giving a list of them. Then I will ask him, when he has given that list, to tell us in each case whether he could have made it more clear. If he cannot, then I will ask him whether that is not a fatal difficulty at once; and if he says "Yes", I will ask him how he holds that an All-wise and Omnipotent God has given us an obscure revelation, which he (Mr. Roberts) could have made clearer. Then he says that the positive evidence is all one way; with that I am quite agreed; the only difficulty is, we are disagreed as to on which side that evidence is to be found. And then there is another difficulty, that we do not understand the word "evidence" in the same way. Mr. Roberts, having to prove something about the state of affairs now existing, quotes, with extreme looseness, Tertullian, and Clement of Rome, and Justin Martyr. Well, that may be some evidence when we get to what it is. But if he were to confine himself to-night to the state of affairs now existing, I don't know what relation it bears to the matter. Then, he says, the Jews exist, and Jeremiah says something about them; Jeremiah says a good many things about them; he says something about the prophets prophesying falsely and telling lies. In the 23rd of Jeremiah you will find a great deal about the prophets lying. Will my friend tell me how much of the prophecies are lies, and how I am to distinguish the lies from the truth, and separate them? Well, then, I want to know why the Jews existing should be more evidence to the truth of the Bible, than the Mahomedans existing to the truth of

the Koran, or the Brahmins existing for their sacred books, or the Buddhists for theirs. I do not say that the argument is utterly irrelevant, but fail to appreciate its relevancy for the moment. Well, then, he says, if the Bible be true, there ought to be corrupt Christians. Well, I shall be obliged if he will give me the exact chapter and verse on which he relies, show me the exact date at which he thinks that chapter and verse came out, and then leave me to deal with them. And then he talks about the writings of the apostles? and says "Are they the writings of the apostles?" and says Mr. Bradlaugh's class have abandoned their first contention, that the book is a monkish production of the fourth and fifth centuries. Well, I never made that contention yet. I will tell you what I have said: that, as far as the Hebrew Bible is concerned, the whole work of the Massorah, which gives the Bible its meaning in that language to-day, cannot be carried back to a date earlier than about that period. But that is a very different thing from saying that the whole Bible is a monkish production of the fourth and fifth centuries; and I have never abandoned that, and scholarship has never refuted it, and I am ready to prove it. But there is a great deal to be done before we get to that; Mr. Roberts has got to make out some revelation to be challenged, and he has not yet presented any at all. Then he has vaguely referred you to Tertullian. Now I object to vague references, because I am prepared to show you, from the writings of Origen, which have been quoted in the same loose fashion, that, if Origen be true, the Scriptures cannot be true, for that Origen makes statements with reference to Bible facts which are not to be found in any page of the Bible at all. I did not dream that we were to have the apostolic fathers to-night; but I may also say that we have not had them, for the references have been so funny, that I have been puzzled as to what was meant. For example, the letter of Clement of Rome has been put to you. Why, Mr. Roberts well knows that the whole of the writings attributed to Clement of Rome, whether his first epistle or second, have all been challenged; that, instead of being able to identify the author of what is called the first epistle of Clement with the person who is claimed to have been the Bishop of Rome, that there is the utmost uncertainty about it; and that in an edition of the Nicene Fathers published in the present day, that very statement is made by the editors of it. Now, I tell Mr. Roberts that I have at least taken the pains to learn the A B C of this argument; therefore, I ask him to give the chapter and verse of every author he quotes. I do not know that there is contemporary evidence of the existence of the four gospels in the alleged writings of the apostle Paul; and I say that, if there were ever so much evidence, you would not be one step nearer proving the question, "Are these Scriptures the authentic record of the Divine revelation?" You would not be near it at all; it is with the contents you have got to deal, the contents of which you have got to examine their teachings. But I urge to you that the whole of the times between the date of the alleged appearance of the writings attributed to Clement and the writings attributed to Origen are simply filled up with hosts of forgeries, are filled up with hosts of frauds, the bulk of which have had to be abandoned; and I say that state of things could not possibly have existed had there been the

real and true evidence which Mr. Roberts would like to have to quote. Now, I will give him just one or two texts, and I will ask him whether, referring to Ex. 32:7-14, I am to find there a fair representation of the character of Deity. The historian there states that God, having chosen Aaron as His priest, while God was choosing him, Aaron made another god for the Jews to worship; that God became angry about it, said to Moses, "Let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may destroy this people;" that Moses remonstrated with God, and argued Him out of it, and then God plagued the people for making the calf that Aaron had made (verse 35). And I say again, look at chap. 28 verse 1, 2 and 3, and tell me whether I am to take that as a fair representation of the character of Deity; and, then, at Numb. 23:19, at Sam. 15:29, at Mal. 3:6, which represents that God cannot repent and cannot change; and then I will draw his attention to 2 Kings 20:1; 2 Sam. 24:15, 16; Gen. 6:6; 1 Sam. 15:11, which show that God did repeatedly repent and change. Now, the chairman warns me that I have just got to the end of my time, and I submit to you, in concluding, that, up to the present moment, there has not been a particle of evidence of any kind advanced by Mr. Roberts in support of his proposition, nor has he given us such an explanation of it as will enable us to understand what he meant by it.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I have now great pleasure in calling upon Mr. Roberts to occupy a quarter of an hour, adopting, if he likes, the Socratic method, and putting questions to Mr. Bradlaugh, and Mr. Bradlaugh at once to reply.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. BRADLAUGH.

Mr. Bradlaugh, do you believe that there ever existed such a man as Jesus Christ?—I do not believe that there ever existed such a man as Jesus Christ, with the history recorded of him in the Four Gospels. It is quite possible that a man named Jesus, not having such history, may have existed.

Then, do I understand you to say that the Christ, who is the subject of the Four Gospels and of Paul's letters, is a historical myth?—I say that that which is represented as the history of Jesus in the Four Gospels and the Epistles is not the history of a real man.

Then I return to my question: do you believe that the man spoken of by Paul, for instance, who says he saw him and laid down his life for him, never existed?—Will you refer me to the exact chapter and verse?

1st Cor. 15:8, "Last of all he was seen of me also".—I have no means of judging whether Paul wrote that or not; therefore cannot answer as to Paul.

That is the chapter and verse you asked for?—You ask me as to Paul's evidence. My answer is, that I have no means of judging whether Paul wrote that or not.

Then, do you say that the Christ Paul spoke about is a historical myth?—I don't know that I have any evidence that Paul spoke of any Christ at all. If you will refer to Corinthians, and, instead of saying Paul, say the writer of the epistle to the Corinthians, I will answer your question.

Do you believe in the authenticity of the history written by Eusebius?—I believe that Eusebius did live and write, and wrote a great many falsehoods.

Do you admit that he was the writer of the history we now have as the history of Eusebius?—Are you speaking of the volume known as Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*?

I speak of his works.—Then I will ask you to specify particularly which of the works.

For my question it is not necessary to speak of any work in particular.—Then I decline to answer a general question. I will answer specifically as to each work of Eusebius I am asked about; my reason for refusing to answer generally is, that in the whole of those centuries, forged writings abounded, and I must confine my answer to the evidence that is presented.

Mr. Bradlaugh, you have admitted that Eusebius wrote?—I never denied it; it is not a question of admitting it: I believe Eusebius did live and did write.

That is my question and the answer to it. Please define to me in a sentence the principle upon which you are persuaded that Eusebius ever lived and ever wrote?—Only that in examining ordinary events, my confidence is given to the best experience of the best men, and that in the case of Eusebius I have no reason to doubt from their investigation that a man named Eusebius did live and did write, and that, in addition, he often forged.

Then I wish to ask whether the reason which you deem sufficient to justify you in believing in Eusebius and his writings does not exist as strongly, and more strongly, in the case of Paul?—No.

Do you mean to say that there is less contemporary evidence to the fact that Paul's writings were received as a literary production?—Which do you call Paul's writings?

I am now speaking of the portion of his epistles included in our common Bible?—I will ask you, then, to specify them by name.

Then I will take the first of Corinthians, for example, and I ask whether there is not the same evidence, and more evidence, in proof of the fact that Paul wrote the 1st of Corinthians than there is in proof that Eusebius wrote his "History"?—No.

What evidence have you Eusebius wrote his "History"?—I am not here to prove that Eusebius wrote his "History": if I were, I should be prepared to prove it.

You have admitted that you believe it; I ask you the reason of your belief?—I

have told you that on all ordinary matters I am in the habit of placing my confidence in the best experience of the best men capable of judging of those occurrences, and that I have done so in the case of Eusebius.

Do you mean to say that there are no men capable of judging the same question with regard to Paul?—That is a very loose question. Do you mean men now or men then?

Men now and men then?—Men then I knew nothing about, and men now I refuse to accept as infallible judges.

Then whose judgment do you accept in the case of Eusebius?—I accept a fairly unbroken line of reference in writers era by era, from the time of Eusebius down to the present time for the opinion I have expressed; but my duty is not to prove that Eusebius wrote, and, therefore, I do not pretend that that which is sufficient now for my belief is sufficient testimony for other people's.

Is there not a fairly unbroken line of references to Paul from the very age of his writing?—No; there are plenty of forgeries from the earlier times which have had to be abandoned.

Will you please say what you mean by a fairly unbroken line of references?—I cannot make it any clearer.

You do not, of course, mean a reference every day?—I did not say so.

Every year?—If I had meant "every year" I should have said so. When I said "fairly unbroken", I meant allowing for the fact that, in some ages, men wrote very little, especially when Christianity was triumphant.

Then, you would accept an occasional—and, comparatively speaking, remote—reference in that case?—I have not said so.

You have said that you accept Eusebius on that line of evidence; that there were intervals during which there was little writing, and yet you accept it, and, therefore, you must admit that you accept occasional references in some cases?—Of course it means occasional references.

Then say "Yes".—I am not going to say "Yes" to words you put into my mouth which I do not utter.

It describes what I mean.—But it does not describe what I mean.

You have denied that there is a fairly unbroken line of reference to the apostle Paul?—Oh no; I have denied that there is a fairly unbroken line of reference to the writings which you say are Paul's.

Then do I understand from that answer that you believe that possibly Paul wrote some other writings than these?—I do not know that my belief as to what Paul may possibly have done elsewhere has anything to do with the question.

Your belief is what I am testing.—You have a right to test my belief so far as it affects the question, and not a bit outside it.

Precisely; and that is just what I am doing; and I ask whether, in your opinion, possibly Paul wrote other writings which are not here?—I have not an opinion on the matter.

Do you mean to say that you have come to so grave a conclusion that these are not Paul's writings without forming an opinion on such a point as that?—I have not even advanced that conclusion, I think. The burden of proof lies on you. I have only to deny. I deny that you have advanced any evidence of it.

Then I ask whether you believe or deny that the 1st epistle to the Corinthians was written by the apostle Paul?—I have no evidence connecting the person whom you call the apostle Paul with that epistle.

Have you a conviction on the subject one way or other?—As a mere matter of conviction, there were so many forgeries that I am inclined to believe he had nothing to do with it; but I do not want to deny that which I have not sufficient evidence to entitle me to deny. What I do deny is, that you can bring the epistle you call the Epistle to the Corinthians within one hundred years of the date at which you say Paul lived.

Then do you mean to say that possibly we are right in believing this to have been written by Paul?—I do not know what evidence you believe it upon.

That is not my question?—I have nothing to do with the possibilities of your being right or not. What you have to do here is to prove your case.

My question is this: Is your conviction with regard to the subject of so loose a character, or are your convictions so indefinite, that possibly we may be right in believing that these are the writings of Paul?—On the contrary, my conviction is that you are entirely wrong.

Then do you deny that this was written by the apostle Paul?—I deny that I have yet *seen* any evidence to warrant me in coming to the conclusion that the person you call the apostle Paul had anything to do with it.

Have you a definite opinion on it?—If that is not definite enough I do not know the meaning of the English language.

“Yes” or “No” would be definite, and I ask yes or no, do you believe that Paul wrote the 1st epistle to the Corinthians?—No, I do not, as a mere matter of belief.

Are you in doubt about it?—No.

You have said that you are not aware of any allusion to the apostle Paul's 1st epistle to the Corinthians by any writer within a hundred years of Paul's day. I will now read you an allusion, and ask your opinion upon it. I quote from the first letter of Clement, which all competent critics admit to be genuine, though abandoning his second epistle.—I utterly deny that all competent critics admit it to be a genuine letter, and I refuse to answer a question to which that is introduced, because it is utterly untrue.

Well, it is not essential to my question; so I will not repeat it. I will read you this from a letter that is admitted by competent critics to have been written by Clement of Rome.—I beg your pardon; in my speech I positively did deny that. I said not only that there was no evidence of its having been written by Clement of Rome, but that that was practically admitted by the editors of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Then I read from this Letter, written, I think, about the year 83.—Will you give me the evidence that it was written about 83? I decline to answer a question which involves a date for which I have no evidence.

Then it comes to this: Mr. Bradlaugh asks me to produce an unbroken line, and when I produce it, he asks me to prove each link. Are you prepared to do that with regard to—?—With regard to everything I advance.

The allusion by Clement in the year 83 to the 1st epistle of Corinthians is as follows: “Why, then, do we rend and tear in pieces the body of Christ, and raise seditions against our own body? Your schism has perverted many; it has discouraged many; it caused diffidence in many and grief in us all, and yet the sedition continues still. *Take the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle into your hands*; what did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel? The truth he wrote to you by the Spirit, concerning himself and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then ye had made divisions among yourselves.” That is a correct description of the epistle as we have it.—And I deny that that is admitted by competent critics; I say part of the two epistles attributed to Clement only exist in one manuscript; that the second is abandoned by nearly all competent critics as a forgery, and that the existing evidence is the same for both.

MR. BRADLAUGH QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

Do you mean by “the Scriptures”, or by “these Scriptures”, the authorised English version of the Bible, commencing with Genesis, and ending with Revelations?—Yes.

Do you agree that the attributes I stated in my speech for Deity are fair attributes?—Not as to one item, with the construction you put upon it.

Which is that?—All-goodness.

You think Deity is not all-good.—In the sense contended for by you, I think He is not.

Will you tell me the sense, if any, in which you would use the word “all-good”?—That His designs, judged by the long run of the thing, are “all-good”, but that in the realisation of those all-good designs, there may be many measures of extremity and severity.

Do you mean for “goodness” as applied to God the same as “goodness” as applied to man?—If you will define goodness as applied to man, I will be in a position to answer.

I mean by goodness applied to man that that is good which tends to the greatest happiness of mankind, with the least injury to any of mankind—I do not admit that definition as applicable to God.

What definition of the word “good” will you give me, then, that is applicable to God?—The development ultimately of the highest good, He only being the judge of what that is.

Do you know what is meant by good?—I have some slight conception; but I don’t govern God by my slight conceptions.

Will you give me your slight conception of it?—That He will ultimately upon the earth develop complete well-being for every person that will finally be alive, on the basis of complete obedience to and honour of Him.

Do you think He could have done that before now?—Not upon the principle He has been pleased to adopt in the development of it, which is a principle requiring the free agency of man.

On any principle could God have done that which you define as “good” before now? Yes or no? on any principle?—It is not for me to say what God could do or could not do; I merely contend for what He has done.

Do you hold that He is all-powerful?—I do.

Do you hold that He is all-wise?—I do.

Do you hold that He knew how to do what was good?—I do.

Do you hold that He could have done what was good?—I won’t answer that, because it implies a case that I don’t recognise.

Will you kindly give me one of the points which you consider a surface contradiction in the Bible?—Well, Solomon in the Proverbs says: “Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou be like unto him;” and adds immediately: “Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit”.

Will you kindly give me the evidence to connect the person you call Solomon with the book you call Proverbs?—Yes; I produce Josephus.

Which of Josephus’s works are you quoting—his “*Antiquities*” or his “*Wars*”?—Both.

Do you know that Josephus, in his references to Bible matters, states many facts which are not in our Bible at all?—In matters of detail, that is correct.

Do you consider Josephus trustworthy or not?—Where he is a personal witness I consider he is.

Do you think he was a personal witness to Solomon writing the Proverbs?—He was a personal witness to the evidence which proved Solomon to have been the writer.

Will you give me a statement of the evidence which Josephus personally witnessed?—He is a witness to the fact that the book constituting the Scriptures—

That is not the question.—You don't know till I have completed my answer.

My question is: what is the evidence of which Josephus was a personal witness in relation to Solomon and the Proverbs?—My answer is: the evidence of a nation's history, of which he was a personal witness, being himself an official person in that nation before its nationality was broken up.

Are you prepared with the evidence from Josephus which verifies that he is a personal witness of any such evidence?—If you deny it, I will perhaps prove it.

Will you undertake to produce that in your first speech to-morrow night?—It may interfere with my argument.

Will you to-morrow night—Yes or no?—Oh! I have my evidence here; I do not need to wait till to-morrow night.

Will you produce it now, then?—Yes.

Then I will ask you to refer to book and section. Mind, my question is not to show that the Jews accepted the Book of Proverbs, but the evidence which you say he was a personal witness of, to justify him in making that statement.—In *Josephus against Apion*, 1st bk., 8th section, he says:—“We have not an innumerable multitude of books amongst us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, as the Greeks have, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine, and of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the tradition of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of 3,000 years; but as to the time from the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after Moses wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life” (including, of course, Proverbs). “It is true our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to those books of our own nation is evident by what we do, for *during so many ages that have already past, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, or take anything from them, or to make any change in them.*”

Will you kindly give me that for a moment? Now, will you find me a word there which says, first, that Solomon wrote Proverbs? and next, the evidence on which Josephus makes the statement?—Solomon's name is not there, the word Proverbs is not there, but the book is there.

Now, I ask you whether you did not tell me that you had the evidence there that Josephus said that Solomon wrote Proverbs, and that Josephus was a personal witness of the evidence?—I did not say so; I said Josephus was a witness of the evidence on which that fact stands.

Then I will ask you to find from Josephus the fact that Solomon wrote Proverbs?—I produce that evidence in what I have read.

It is not in what you have read?—I will show it you. I have admitted that the name of Solomon and Proverbs is not there.

Then do you mean when a man does not mention another man, it is evidence that he thinks he wrote something?—No, I do not. The Book of Proverbs is included there.

What I have denied and what you have said was there, are two things. First, you said that Josephus was witness that Solomon wrote Proverbs: that I did not care about; next, you said that Josephus was a witness on evidence of which he had personal witness. I ask you to prove both those statements, and you prove neither. Do you abandon them or confirm them?—No, indeed, I do not abandon them; I do not affirm what you have put in my mouth.

Do you think that, although neither Proverbs nor Solomon are named in the extract, there is positive evidence, in what you have read from *Apion*, of what you said?—Yes.

That is your sort of positive evidence. Well, will you kindly now give me another instance of a contradiction which you consider a contradiction on the surface?—I did not come prepared with a list of these.

Then may I ask you whether you know anything at all of Egyptian chronology?—I know a little about it, not so much as I know about the Bible.

Do you know that the contention of Bunsen, in his *Egypt's Place in the History of the World*, and of Lepsius, and of Champollion Figeac, is that the Hebrew chronology, as contained in the authorised version, does not allow sufficient time for the proved civilisation of Egypt?—I am aware that this is the contention of those writers.

Do you know that Professor Rawlinson, lecturer for the Christian Evidence Society, has admitted that the Hebrew chronology does not allow sufficient time for civilisation?—I am not aware of it, but I am disposed to accept it on your declaration.

Is it your opinion that the Hebrew chronology does or does not allow sufficient time?—I think it allows sufficient time in view of a circumstance which has not been taken sufficiently into account by those authorities you refer to, and that is, the far greater capacities of men in these ages, as evidenced by the erection of the Pyramids, and sundry other things, to turn to account the forces of nature, steam excepted. In view of that, I think there is ample time allowed in the Hebrew chronology for the civilisation of Egypt.

Do you know that he says that he hesitates to carry the date farther back for fear of interfering with the deluge of Noah?—As his opinion does not bear on the question, I do not concern myself with it one way or another.

Do you deny that that is so?—I prefer dealing with the first records, the first evidences.

Tell me what book you should consider the best authority for me to take against you as an authority on Egyptian chronology?—I am not prepared to give you an opinion.

Do you know a book which is a good authority on Egyptian chronology?—Generally, I do.

Which one?—Particularly, I do not.

Give me a general one?—I am simply aware of the existence of such books and of the general tenor of their arguments, but I am not familiar in that particular way which your question wishes to commit me to.

But name me some one of them whom you have read and think I may fairly take?—My attention has been devoted to the first authorities, and not to the secondary.

But give me a first authority.—I am prepared to debate the question on the first principles of the thing.

Give me what you consider a first authority upon Egyptian chronology.—Egyptian chronology is presented to my mind in a sufficiently satisfactory form in the Hebrew Scriptures.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen.—Mr. Roberts will now have a quarter of an hour in which to address you.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Bradlaugh's opening remarks, in his speech in reply to mine, addressed themselves to a matter which afforded me a little surprise, though perhaps I need not have been surprised, and that is his challenging me to the production of the particular authorities upon which I rested those general statements concerning the evidence upon which the authenticity of the New Testament is based. I thought that those matters were so well known to, and accepted by, all educated men that it would only be a waste of time to resort to the technicalities into which he sought to draw me. But, nevertheless, I am not unprepared to give the references which he has demanded. I have given one reference, or was in the act of giving one reference, when my turn for questioning came to a close: and that is the 1st epistle of Clement, the 20th chapter, the 20th and 21st verses. He says he was unaware of any expression of Justin Martyr's which made mention of the Four Gospels. I will read him an extract from Justin Martyr's "*Apology of the Emperor*", in which he will find that the expression

occurs which he denied. This is Justin Martyr's description of Christian worship in the second century, in his "Apology".

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Will you kindly quote book, section, and page?

Mr. ROBERTS: I am not prepared with a reference to the section, but I will get it if you desire it.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: In this debate we shall never end if we don't, because, in the case of Justin Martyr, the only place in which the phrase translated, "Acts of the Apostles" occurs, it is challenged as a forgery, and therefore it is necessary that any quotations should be specifically made.

Mr. ROBERTS: I will supply the references afterwards.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I object to any quotations from Justin Martyr. We have six nights, and it can be supplied when my friend is ready.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it will be as well, and perfectly more in order, if Mr. Roberts is allowed to occupy his fifteen minutes, and then for Mr. Bradlaugh, have his fifteen minutes, just to say what he likes. I think it best for each to occupy their position — one the speaker, the other to sit and listen.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: On the question of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to address you.

The CHAIRMAN: According to my judgment, it will be a deal better for Mr. Roberts to take his fifteen minutes.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: But you have not heard my point of order. On a question of order, I ask your leave to address you.

The CHAIRMAN: If I have my way, I think it advisable, without any question being put by Mr. Bradlaugh, that Mr. Roberts should occupy his fifteen minutes. I think it will be better; that is my judgment.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: You don't allow me, then, to state my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: Not while Mr. Roberts is speaking.

Mr. ROBERTS: This is an extract from the writings of Justin Martyr, and if Mr. Bradlaugh denies the correctness of it, I will supply him with the exact reference; and if he finds out that the reference does not justify what I now allege, it will be a damaging thing to me for him to supply that to the meeting afterwards. In his first "Apology", addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and written in the second century, he describes the worship of the Christians, and after having mentioned what, he says, was "written by the apostles in *the memorials which they have made, WHICH ARE CALLED GOSPELS,*" he says: "On the day called Sunday, there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell in the cities or in the countries, and memorials of the apostles or the writings of the prophets, are read as time may permit. Afterwards, when he who reads has ended, he who presides admonishes

and exhorts by word to imitate these good things." I will not read the whole of the extract, because it proceeds to deal with matters that have no immediate and direct reference to the particular point for which I cite the quotation — the object of the citation of the quotation being to show that there was an allusion by Justin Martyr to the fact that at the meetings of Christians in the second century, there were books that were read that passed current under the general designation of *Memorials of the Apostles* — that is to say, the writings of histories; and here we have such writings which have been received from that day down to ours; and if these be not those writings, is Mr. Bradlaugh prepared to show what they are to which Justin Martyr here makes reference?

But I will now finish the part of the argument which I was obliged to break off in my opening address, and that was an undertaking, on my part, to prove also the authenticity of the books that constitute the Old Testament. The nature of the evidence upon that point is this. Some may say: "What evidence have we that there existed before the days of Christ a compilation of works such as that which now constitutes that part of the Bible called the Old Testament?" That evidence I produce first from the New Testament; and the evidence here is exceedingly extensive, far more extensive than I shall be justified, in the limited time at my disposal, in placing before you; but I will refer to such general features as this: we have it recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, the 17th chapter, that "Paul, as his manner was, went into the synagogue, and reasoned with them out of *the Scriptures*", the writings. If we ask what writings, we find the question answered in the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the 23rd verse: When they (the Jews) had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging, to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both *out of the law of Moses, and out of the Prophets*, from morning till evening." Therefore, in Paul's day the law of Moses was known as a standard of reference accepted among the Jews, and also the writings of the prophets. Then I will bring the testimony of Christ, concerning whom I hope to have much to say upon another evening, and whose case is far removed from the mythical region to which Mr. Bradlaugh's contention compels him to relegate him. Indeed, it is the fact that the more educated class of unbelievers have now one and all abandoned the theory of a mythical invention, and admit that Jesus Christ was a historic personage, who actually appeared among the Jews, and the record of whose life as recorded by the apostles, is in the main historic. I say, when we come to consider Christ, we see in his life evidence of the prior existence of a compilation of writings accepted amongst the Jews as a standard of reference and knowledge in divine things; for consider that touching incident connected with the events that happened on the third day after his crucifixion, when the women went to the tomb and found it empty, and when that same day, two of his disciples were going on a distant errand, and were sad concerning the circumstances that had just transpired, and were ignorant of the fact that he had arisen; and Christ drew near to them and said, "What manner of communications are these that ye have one to

another as ye walk and are sad?" And they said, "Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?" And he said unto them, "What things?" And they said unto him, "Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people" — in the 24th chapter of Luke you will find it, Mr. Bradlaugh — and they expressed their great bewilderment with regard to the fact of his crucifixion, and Christ said: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at *Moses and all the prophets*, he expounded unto them *in all the Scriptures* the things concerning himself."

I have given a specimen of the kind of evidence that proves that the New Testament was in circulation throughout the Christian community towards the close of the first century, and I shall have more to say about that to-morrow night in a different connection. But observe that, if that argument be established, then the authenticity, or at all events the prior existence of Moses and the prophets as a national accepted standard of reference is also proved, and is proved in even a more conclusive manner than that, though not more conclusive in a logical sense, perhaps, but more conclusive as regards the common conceptions of people. I refer to what I have read, for instance, from the writings of Josephus, whose writings cannot be impugned, whose book was written, before the first century was over, by an eye-witness of the destruction of Jerusalem; and he in the words I have read this evening, in answer to a question by Mr. Bradlaugh, gives you the testimony of an official Jew of these writings having been in circulation among the Jews for ages, and accepted by them all; and Josephus's declaration on that point is collaterally confirmed by a circumstance of the most specific and decisive character. What is that? Ptolemy Philadelphus, a literary King of Egypt — one of the distinguishing features of whose reign was that he made a collection of all the books that he could collect in the wide-world — finally decided to obtain a copy of a book he was told was in circulation among the Jews; and he communicated with the high priest of Jerusalem — at that time, I think, Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabaeus — and requested him to send these books in the proper custody, that they might be translated into the Greek language, so as to be open to the reference of the world in general in the library that he established; and they did it, and we have that translation of theirs existing and current in the present day, and accepted and recognised by all educated men. I refer to the Septuagint, which is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures effected about 300 years before Christ; and, therefore, in that, we have a demonstration of the sort which I undertook to produce, namely that not only were the writings of the New Testament current among all the Christian community throughout the world — for, mind you, it is not one part of the world: there is Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus in France, Clement at Rome, three widely separated parts of the world in these comparatively barbarous ages. At all these places the same New Testament Scriptures were in circulation, and were quoted as commonly by the writers in

those days, as the New Testament is quoted by ministers in the present day. I say that, having proved the circulation of the New Testament at that early period, I have upon the foundation of that proof also proved that the books of the Old Testament existed for at least three centuries previously, indeed more than that; for what was it that incited Ptolemy Philadelphus to obtain that translation? Was it not the wide-spread knowledge that there was, and had been for ages, in the hands of the Jews this volume? Therefore the resolution of Ptolemy Philadelphus to obtain that translation is of itself evidence of the previous existence of those documents for a good while before at least; and we can carry the argument much further back than that by a process which will, perhaps, be better exemplified on some of the other evenings, when we come to substantiate some of the other propositions. The Chairman calling my attention to the time, has broken the line of my argument, and therefore I will leave Mr. Bradlaugh to take his turn.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: First, the evidence as to the Septuagint is exactly the opposite to the statement Mr. Roberts has made, and it shows, therefore, the misfortune in conducting this debate without giving authorities as we go on. Mr. Roberts — and I am quite sure that he means to tell you, at least I think so, what he believes to be true — Mr. Roberts must be utterly unacquainted with all the criticism on the subject, or he would know, when he says that it is accepted and recognised by all educated men, that one of the very latest amongst orthodox writers, the Rev. Dr. Irons, one of the officials of St. Paul's at the present moment, in his book, entitled *The Bible and its Interpreters*, says no man knows when the Septuagint was translated, who translated it, where the version was made, or how it was made; and I will undertake to prove to you that the balance of criticism is utterly against your view; so that it shows that, in these kind of statements, you want to know the evidence on which your antagonists rely. I do not want to be in the painful position of telling Mr. Roberts each time, Your statement is not true. I want him to give me the evidence on which he relies, and then I will show him where the supposed evidence is no evidence at all; but if he simply makes general statements, and tells you that it is accepted and recognised by all educated men, when a statement of that kind simply means that he has not read what educated men have written about it; and when he tells you that it is the matter of chronology alone, one version differs about 900 years; and in another version the difference is over 1,200 years from the Hebrew, and, therefore, cannot possibly be a translation of it. Mr. Roberts has got to prove his case, and I must ask him to state his evidence on which he relies for the Septuagint translation, and then I will reply to it. Evidently, Mr. Roberts and I differ as to what is evidence. He said he was going to prove from Justin Martyr the existence of the Four Gospels, and he read to you something about Memorials of the Apostles, but what on earth there is to identify those with the Four Gospels, in the books, as we have got them, I do not know, and it requires a mind like Mr. Robert's to get the evidence out of it. That passage says nothing of any gospels, and would be as good evidence for forty gospels as for four; and I will show you that in the time of Justin Martyr, forty

gospels and writings of apostles existed, at least; and I will tell Mr. Roberts where he can get a list of them — in the Rev. Jeremiah Jones's *Canon of the New Testament*. Jeremiah Jones has made an index of what he calls the Apocryphal Books and Gospels. Then he says that he read from Josephus's testimony. Well now, there again we differ as to the meaning of words. He was to prove from Josephus that Solomon wrote the Proverbs, and that Josephus had knowledge of the evidence which entitled him to say that Solomon wrote the Proverbs; and when he read it, there was not a word about Solomon, not a single word about the Proverbs. Well, if that is evidence, the sooner we leave off this debate the better. Then again, he quoted Clement of Rome, and he did not quote; and here is another difficulty: if my friend brought here the works themselves to quote from, I should be able to say, if he told me which edition it was, "turn to the preface, and you will find my arguments against it there, in the handwritings of your own men;" but when he simply quotes loose statements from other writers, there is no sort of reply to that kind possible. And when he says, "Oh! if Mr. Bradlaugh disputes, I will prove", that is not the question: his business is to prove as he goes on, and not to make loose statements, which require proof at some later time. Now, he says something about the women who went to the tomb, and he gave me chapter and verse, as he saw I was looking at the Bible; but he did not know what I was referring to. I want to know whether God revealed that, according to Matt. 28, two women went; or, according to John 20:1, that one woman went; or, according to Luke 24, that several women went; and I want to know whether Mary went by herself, or whether several went with her; and I want to know whether that is one of the surface contradictions which Mr. Roberts had forgotten, and which he said he would look up for me. Then Mr. Roberts is good enough to say that he will refer you to Acts 28:23. But what does that prove? Simply that there were current in the alleged time of Jesus, works which were called the law of Moses and the prophets. I have never denied that. But you have got first to identify those with the Bible as we have them, and then to prove that this is divine revelation. A loose statement of that kind is no sort of evidence at all. It is only evidence of the existence of something called the "law of Moses"; and I will defy Mr. Roberts to identify the Pentateuch with those words, because I will show you from the Bible itself plenty of places in which the word "law" is used, which cannot possibly mean the whole of the contents of the Pentateuch. And do not forget that Mr. Roberts has not said one word about the texts to which I called his attention: these texts affecting the goodness, omnipotence and immutability of Deity. Those are passed over; and then he tells you that all educated men have abandoned the mythical theory regarding the Christ. Well, now, that is really a little too strong. I do not know that it would amount to anything if it were proved; but it is not even, in the remotest degree proved. What most men are prepared to concede is what I conceded in the answer to Mr. Roberts. The name which is rendered "Jesus", is only a form of the Hebrew word "Joshua". It is quite possible there was a real man on whom the myth has been centred; but there is not

an educated man who admits a real Jesus, who was born without a father; whose husband's mother had two fathers; who lived at the same time in Judea and Egypt; who was known by John, and not known by him at the same moment of time; who was crucified, and in the grave three days and three nights, between late on Friday evening and the period which elapsed before Saturday night was quite over. Now, if Mr. Roberts should tell me those statements are not in the Bible, he will have an opportunity of asking me for texts, and he will find that I can quote him chapter and verse for every one of them. Now, I will ask him to take another illustration; whether Genesis 28:20, 21, where God is represented as saying that the story has reached Him about Sodom and Gomorrah, and that He is going to inquire, and will know — whether that is consistent with the omniscience of Deity, and whether what follows is consistent with the goodness of the Deity? And don't forget here that I hold exactly the doctrine put forward by John Stuart Mill: I hold that you have not the right to apply the word "goodness" in one sense in reference to man, and in some other sense in reference to God, and then tell me you cannot explain what that second sense is. I hold it is an entire abandonment of the whole of the debate to make any such contention as that. If Mr. Roberts does not know what goodness means, he ought not to be here; if he does, he ought to tell us. He ought not to tell us that goodness for God may not mean the same thing now as it may a thousand years hence, or as it did a thousand years since. A book which represents as an all-good God, guilty of evil acts, cannot be a Divine revelation. Then I will ask him as to Deut. 8:2, and 2 Chron. 32:31, whether these are consistent with God's omniscience? I will ask him whether the whole story of the Fall, omitting its absurdities, is not one of the most monstrous stories as a picture of the character of the Deity? whether it does not picture God making the Garden of Eden a damnation-trap in which to catch the whole of the human race, so that he may punish them; I will ask him whether the whole story of the Deluge, admitting its monstrous improbabilities and impossibilities, does not picture God as a cruel Deity, who would delight rather in punishing than reforming, and who slaughtered all living beings, the innocent with the guilty; I will ask him whether the case of Jacob and Esau, referred to in Mal. 1:2, does not show that God either loved the man because he was a rascal, or in spite of it; because he was a liar, or in spite of it; because he helped to rob his uncle; or in spite of it; because he cheated his brother, or in spite of it; and whether it does not show that He hated Esau, because he had the misfortune to be cheated, and the virtue to be forgiving, or in spite of it. I submit that on either contention it is utterly inexplicable with the contention that the Bible is the revelation of God. And then I will take him to 1st Kings 11:33, 34, 38; 14:8, where it says David never did anything but good; did only that which was right in the sight of God; I will ask him whether David was not a thief, a liar, a murderer, a perjurer, an adulterer, a traitor, a scoundrel, all through, who did not even repent when he died? how could such a man have obeyed all God's statutes and commandments? And I will point out to him that, very curiously, he is wasting all his learned evidence on people who are certainly

very remote from the time of Moses, and he does it in the funniest way, for he quotes you Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Clement of Rome; and he talks of "those days", as if they all lived at that time. Would you talk of a man who lived in 1745, and another who lived in 1845, as living in "those days"? Now, I ask my friend not to assume that I am ignorant of all these things. I do not assume to be a learned man, but there is not an author he can quote in relation to this subject that I will not, when he has quoted him, tell him what can be said for or against him.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Roberts will now occupy six minutes out of the twelve remaining, and then Mr. Bradlaugh will reply till ten o'clock.

Mr. ROBERTS: Ladies and gentlemen; if Mr. Bradlaugh would strictly confine himself to accuracy in his representations of what I say, my arguments would not suffer in his hands. I have not represented that those authorities I have quoted were contemporary. I have given, in each case, the year in which they wrote.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: No.

Mr. ROBERTS: I have. I stated that Clement wrote A.D. 83, and that Tertullian wrote in the middle of the second century. I gave those general indications, and certainly never committed myself to the absurdity of supposing that men living in the first century and the second could, by any construction, be said to be contemporary. He has given me a great many passages to explain. I wish he would give me them as questions. I will undertake to answer every one of them if they are put to me in the colloquial style of the Socratic method; but how can I, in six minutes, explain twenty or thirty alleged discrepancies, which discrepancies I am persuaded, do not exist. I have read through a list of 144 so-called contradicitions, issued by a Secular Society in America; and with the exception of some five or six, there is not even the shadow of a difficulty to contend with, and every one of them in the process of question and answer, I would undertake to explain, and I would do so in a speech, were the speech of sufficient dimensions to admit of it. With regard to the Septuagint, I did not speak at random in saying what I said; I gave the evidence on which my statement rests. There is the Septuagint; there is such a book; it is substantially a transcript of the Hebrew Scriptures, though I grant there are discrepancies of the sort he mentioned; that is to say, the chronology does not agree; there has been tampering somewhere, undoubtedly, but there is the fact; here is a literary monument, which, apart from all discrepancies, certainly proves what I quoted it to prove: and that is, that the Hebrew Scriptures existed as a literary compilation, at least in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and I do not produce it to prove anything more than that. The simplest mind is capable of receiving that argument; for where does the Septuagint come from, if there were not Hebrew Scriptures from which to make a translation? What is the account of it? Josephus here gives us an account of it. We have both the book, and an account of how the book came into existence. The only thing Mr. Bradlaugh can do is to say, "How do I know that Josephus is speaking the truth?" He tells us he believes in Eusebius because there is an unbroken line of reference; and then, as I

proceed to unfold my references in regard to Paul, he says, "How do I know that he wrote that letter you are referring to?" On the principle that Mr. Bradlaugh is contending for to-night, I deny that he can possibly prove that there ever existed such a person as Eusebius, or that he ever wrote the books that bear his name; indeed, he cannot prove the existence of Shakespeare on the same principle, for he never saw him, and he has no certain evidence that he wrote the book — that is to say upon his principle. I admit that there is evidence in regard to Shakespeare, and in regard to Eusebius, and in regard to Paul; and there would never have been any objection to the evidence in regard to Paul if his case had not involved evidence of Christ's resurrection. I produce, then, this statement of Josephus in reference to the Septuagint.—(*Josephus's Antiquities*; book 12, sections 1 and 4.) Those two sections contain a sufficiency of evidence on the point. I will read one or two extracts, though I am afraid the time will scarcely admit of it to-night. Of course, I am well aware that critics have written against it; but, nevertheless, my remark, in its general form, is unimpeachable, and that is, that critical, judicial, clear, unbiassed minds there are that receive the Septuagint as the translation made in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Your statement was that the Septuagint was accepted and recognised by all educated men; you made no exception whatever. You have curiously forgotten that I said that you classed together Clement of Rome, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenaeus, as "of those days"; and you said you gave the date of Tertullian. I did not say a word about Tertullian, and I say that you did not give the dates of the others; and it would be a great deal better if you would attend to exactly what I say, and not answer what I do not say. It is perfectly true that in six minutes you could not answer all the contradictions, but you might have answered one. Instead of that you have referred to an American society that has issued 144 contradictions; and you have said that I cannot prove the existence of Shakespeare. Supposing I cannot, that would not show that the Bible is a divine revelation. On matters of ordinary occurrence, I accept the best experience of the best men as I find it fairly recorded, and upon that canon of evidence I can prove all reasonable historic events. It is only when you give me an extraordinary occurrence — of men who have no fathers; who are in the grave when they are out of it; and who are seen by one woman, who is two women, who are more than three women; it is then that the experience does not apply; and, surely, in six minutes you might have taken one illustration. If you would devote yourself to doing that, then we should have this matter cleared up very much. Now, I submit that, though we have got nearly to the end of our first night's debate, there has not been an attempt to state the attributes of Deity on the other side. There is an admission now that there is the variation I said in the chronology between the Septuagint and the Hebrew, which in one case is 900 years, and in the other, 1,200 years; and those are called trifling differences; but are we to be damned or saved by them? And you say there have been tamperings. Is it by God's consent or against it? And then you say, Oh! you quote the Septuagint to prove that the Hebrew books existed in the time of Ptolemy; but you have got to prove that your

Septuagint translation was made in the time of Ptolemy. A statement of Josephus will not prove it, because you have got to go back to something behind it; and I will, to-morrow, give you the whole of the evidence for and against the Septuagint. I will quote every author about it. You ought to do it; but if you will not, I must do the work that you ought to do, unless you abandon the evidence. Now, I ask, that through this debate, when an author is quoted, that we shall have the author and his express words, and the date when he is supposed to have written, and not general statements that all educated men have accepted it. I submit that, up to the present moment, not one atom of evidence has been advanced in support of the proposition that Mr. Roberts has undertaken to prove.

Second Night,
WEDNESDAY, 14th JUNE, 1876,
IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL, LEICESTER.

THE CHAIR WAS OCCUPIED BY MR. W. STANYON OF LEICESTER.

The CHAIRMAN having asked the meeting to refrain from the expression of their feelings, called upon Mr. Roberts to resume the debate.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, in commencing my remarks this evening, I will comply with the request made by Mr. Bradlaugh last night, and define what I mean by the proposition that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation. By the Scriptures, I mean that compilation of writings that passes current in English society under the name of the Bible. By the proposition that these writings are authentic, I mean that they were really written by the persons by whom they profess to have been written, and at the time at which they profess to have been written; and, that, therefore, they are authentic; and, that, besides being authentic, they are reliable; that is, we can put our trust in them as an accurate record of the various matters which they profess to set forth. Those matters are, in my contention, the records of divine revelation, or rather the record involves the setting forth of divine revelation. By that I mean a communication of knowledge concerning God, which we could not otherwise have attained; and by God I mean the primal energy, force, wisdom, power, strength, or whatever other term you choose to employ to define the first creative energy from which things have had their development or their outcome, thinking it necessary only to add that in my belief, the view of that power presented in the Scriptures is the right one, viz., that in its totality, so to speak, that power is a person, having in their highest degree, all the attributes which go to constitute personality, consciousness, perception, volition, & c. Beyond this, I will not occupy time in presenting any abstract view of God, for we might occupy the whole six nights in discussing the thing in a metaphysical way without arriving at anything like a tangible result. In this connection I will remind Mr. Bradlaugh and his friends, that even upon their hypothesis, there is inscrutable mystery at the basis of things as they are. I can call no better witness to that fact than Professor Tyndall, a man great in the particular school to which these friends belong. He — in an inaugural address at the meeting of the British Association, at Manchester — says: “Science does not in any degree lessen the wonder with which we look at the material universe. At best it only marshalls the phenomena of nature under the head of all its sequences, which are called law; but the great ocean of the unknown simply recedes as we advance, and all the researches that science may make to the end of time will never abridge by one hairsbreadth the infinite expanse of mystery across the boundless ocean. The curiosity of the intellect will always sail towards

an ever-vanishing horizon. The region of mystery lies not merely in the distance, but also at our very feet". He says when he has looked at the spring-tide, at the sprouting leaves, and grass, and flowers; when he has seen the general joy of opening life, he has asked himself, "Can it be that there is no being or thing in nature that knows more about these matters than I do? Can it be that I, in my ignorance, represent the highest knowledge existing of these matters in the universe?" And his answer is: "The man who puts that question to himself, if he be not a shallow man; if he be capable of being penetrated by a profound thought, will never answer it by professing that creed of Atheism which has been so lightly attributed to me." Therefore, I think that, in view of the fact that even upon the hypothesis of an insentient nature, so to speak, being the author of what we see, we land ourselves at last against a dead wall of mystery, it would be bootless for me to attempt to define, in a philosophical sense, what I mean by the word *God*, or the phrase *primal energy*. Suffice it to say that there is a primal energy in that particular phase in which He or *it* — if Mr. Bradlaugh prefers that pronoun — is presented in these records which constitute the ancient archives of the Jews. The truth, then, of the proposition I seek to maintain, not by hair-splitting, or far-fetched or misty arguments, but by submitting a plain, broad, common sense argument in matters of world-wide notoriety, which the meanest intellect can apprehend when brought to bear.

My contention last night was that, taking the Bible in our hands with the idea of believing it, we should be compelled, on the hypothesis of its being true, to expect to find existing at the present day the nation of the Jews and a corrupt political Christianity; and I pointed to the fact that these are in existence. Further, I produced evidence of the other fact, which ought to be capable of some degree of demonstration, that these writings existed at the time, and were in current circulation amongst the believers of it at the time they were produced. To-night I will take one step further, a more important step, and introduce a more interesting topic, perhaps — though the topic of last night was not uninteresting, and certainly not unimportant, for it constituted a necessary preliminary and a foundation for what is to follow. But the matter I am to speak of to-night appeals more directly to the common cognitions of men. I refer to the uprise in the world of the system bearing the name of Christianity. That system must have a history. Christianity did not spring up out of the ground; it did not come mysteriously out of the atmosphere; it is traceable back to certain circumstances that planted it in the world; and it is to those circumstances that I now call your attention, as furnishing the most palpable evidence of the truth of the proposition for which I am contending. And, first, let me say, there are not only Christians to-day, but there were Christians in the first century, and widely multiplied. It is necessary for me to prove that, as a step in the argument, by way of making it invincible; and I prove it by two citations, which, I think Mr. Bradlaugh will not call in question, and to which, probably, he has the scholastic access, without calling on me to produce a technical reference, though I will do that if he asks it. I refer to the

testimony of Tacitus, the Roman historian, who lived at the close of the first century, and I refer to the letter written by Pliny the Younger to the Emperor Trajan in the year 112, asking the Emperor's advice as to how he was to deal with this rising sect of Christians, if they were to be murdered wholesale, as had been the custom. I will quote his very words, merely to show that there was a great multitude of believers in Christ in that age, as a preliminary to enquiring how came that multitude to be brought into the conviction they were entertaining — convictions which brought them nothing but evil as regards this world — for which they suffered death by martyrdom. I find Pliny's letter at the close of the words of Josephus, although, I believe, it is also extant in the writings of Jerome, and also in a book bearing Pliny's name, *The Epistles of Pliny*. This is the letter: "Sir.—It is my constant method to apply myself to you for the resolution of all my doubts." Now, please, transport yourselves back in imagination to A.D. 112; let the mind act telescopically to-night; let us remember that there have been centuries before our time; let us try to detach our consciousness from the immediate connection of present circumstances, and realise the facts that have gone before. Pliny the Younger, writing to the Emperor Trajan at Rome, says: "I have never been present at the execution of the Christians (by others), on which account I am unacquainted with what used to be inquired into, and what and how far they are to be punished. Nor are my doubts small whether there be not a distinction to be made between the ages (of the accused), and whether tender youth ought to have the same punishment with strong men; whether there be not room for pardon upon repentance, and whether it may not be an advantage to one that had been a Christian that he has forsaken Christianity; whether the bare name, without any crimes besides, or the crime of adhering to the name is to be punished? In the meantime, I have taken this course about those who have been brought before me as Christians. I asked them whether they were Christians or not. If they confessed that they were Christians, I asked them again and a third time, intervening threatenings with the questions. If they persevered in their confessions, I ordered them to be executed; for I did not doubt, but let their confessions be of any sort whatsoever, this positiveness and inflexible obstinacy deserve to be punished. There have been some of this mad sect whom I took notice of in particular as Roman citizens, that they might be sent to the city. After some time, as is usual in such circumstances, the crime spread itself, and many more cases came before me . . . Hereupon, I have put off any further examinations, and have recourse to you, for the affair seems to be well worth consultation, *especially on account of the number of those that are in danger*; for there are many of every age, of every rank, and of both sexes, who are now and hereafter likely to be called to account and to be in danger; for this superstition *is spread like a contagion, not only into cities and towns, but into country villages also*, which yet there is reason to hope may be stopped and corrected. To be sure, temples *which were almost forsaken*, begin already to be frequented, and the holy solemnities, *which were long intermitted*, begin to be revived. The sacrifices begin

to sell well everywhere, of which very few purchasers had of late appeared. Whereby it is easy to suppose how *great a multitude* of men may be amended if place for repentance be admitted.”

Now, observe this testimony, in A.D. 112, points back a long way into the first century, in saying that for a long time the worship of the idols *had been given up* on account of what he calls “this Christian superstition”. The testimony of Tacitus, for the knowledge of which the world, for a long time, was solely indebted to the extracts given by Josephus in his *Antiquities*, is as follows: “Nero”, says Tacitus, “in order to stifle the rumour (that he had himself set Rome on fire) ascribed it to those people who were hated for their wicked practices, and called by the vulgar Christian. These he, Nero, punished exquisitely. The author of the same was Christ, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was brought to punishment by Pontius Pilate, the Procurator not only over Judea, whence this mischief first sprang, but in the City of Rome also”. That is sufficient for my present purpose: and by that testimony I have proved the existence, in the first century, of a vast multitude throughout the Roman Empire believing in Christ, and suffering all manner of disadvantages and evils in consequence of that belief; and I have to ask, What was the sacrifice for? I mean what did they sacrifice all these advantages for? Was it for the sake of a religious opinion? Was it for a mere belief in what somebody else had said? If it was, I grant that the argument would only go to show their sincerity; it would not necessarily show that the opinion which they sincerely entertained was a correct one. But I am now to call your attention to the fact that it was not a matter of opinion for which they suffered, but a matter of fact, of which the leading members of their body were personal witnesses. To that fact I wish now to call your attention, and I also particularly invite your consideration to the question of whether there was a possibility of any mistake about the matter. Pliny could not tell the cause of the multiplication of this people; Tacitus could not give the Emperor to understand what was the secrets of the obstinacy of this “vulgar Christian sect” in the maintenance of their convictions unto death. We must, therefore, go to the writings which I showed last night, and which I am prepared to show much more extensively than I did then, were in extensive circulation amongst this multitude of persecuted people. We must go to those writings to find out the secret of that confidence.

Now I first call as evidence a Roman Governor — not one of themselves — Festus, I think, who had arraigned before him Paul, the ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, and the most effective instrument in the diffusion of the faith of Christ. He heard him himself, and afterwards held a joint hearing with Agrippa. Festus thus states the cause to the King: “There is a certain man left in bonds by Felix, about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and the elders of the Jews informed me, desiring to have judgment against him, to whom I answered, It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him. Therefore, when they were come thither,

without any delay on the morrow, I sat on the judgment-seat, and commanded the man to be brought forth; against whom, when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed, but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of *one Jesus, who was dead, WHOM PAUL AFFIRMED TO BE ALIVE.*” That is Festus’s definition of the question that was at issue between Paul and his accusers; was it a correct definition by Festus? In answer to that, I invite your attention to a number of statements by the apostles themselves, which go to show that that was the matter involved in their public testimony. In the first chapter of Acts, at a meeting of the apostles after the ascension of Christ, and before the Day of Pentecost, when the question of the vacancy created by the apostasy of Judas came to be considered, this counsel was given one to another: “Wherefore of these men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be *a witness with us of HIS RESURRECTION.*” In the second chapter of the Acts, at the 32nd verse, Peter, in making a speech to a great congregation of Jews, who had been brought together by the great marvel which we shall have to consider at a later stage of the evening, viz., a number of men speaking languages they had never learnt, says: “*This Jesus hath God raised up, WHEREOF WE ALL ARE WITNESSES.*” *Witnesses!* In Acts 3:14, we have a speech delivered before the Jewish authorities, who tried to suppress this testimony: “Ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life, *whom God hath raised from the dead; WHEREOF WE ARE WITNESSES.*” “Whereof we are *witnesses.*” Acts 4:10: “Be it known unto you all” — this is another speech on another occasion — “and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, *whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole.* This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved”. Acts 5:29: “Peter and the other apostles answered and said” — again addressing themselves to the magistrates on the bench, who were telling them on no account to persist in this preaching of theirs, as they were filling Jerusalem with sedition, and that it would be at the peril of their liberty and life if they did; their answer is, “We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers *raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins unto Israel. And WE ARE HIS WITNESSES OF THESE THINGS, and so is also the Holy Spirit whom God hath given to them that obey Him,*” — the full pith of which latter statement we shall have to consider upon a subsequent occasion.

There are other statements of the same sort, but these are sufficient for the present purpose, and, therefore, I will leave it there, and ask, Was their witness true? What did they allege as the basis of their convictions upon the point? Acts 4:19: “Peter and John answered and said unto them” — on another occasion

before magistrates again — “Whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For *we cannot but speak the THINGS WHICH WE HAVE SEEN AND HEARD.*” Acts 1:3: “To whom” — that is to the disciples—“he (Christ) showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, *being seen of them forty days*”—nearly six weeks—“speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.” In Acts 10:39, in the house of Cornelius, Peter declares: “**WE ARE WITNESSES OF ALL THINGS WHICH HE DID** both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they slew and hanged on a tree: *him God raised up the third day*, and showed him openly; not unto all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead*”. Therefore, observe, they were not put to death for entertaining a certain religious opinion; they were not put to death because they believed on the testimony of somebody else that Christ rose. Their testimony was: “We who were with him during his life in the flesh — we who saw him crucified, have seen him alive and spent six weeks in his company, and he parted with us upon a certain occasion, with a promise to return.” And now comes the question, What led them to make that statement? Did they get anything by it? Why! they just got all the things that all men everywhere, in every country and in every age, seek to avoid; they got poverty, they got insult, they got imprisonment, they got death. Everyone of the apostles lost their lives for it; perhaps I ought to qualify that statement; some of them, I believe, according to ecclesiastical tradition, came to a peaceful end; but, nevertheless, a great proportion of them suffered death for their testimony. Therefore, their sincerity cannot be impugned; for there is never a lie told by an impostor but that it is to get some good to himself by it; and as soon as the good does not come, and as soon as the bad begins to come, you will see him flinch and turn round.

This is no case of imposture; therefore, the question is, were they mistaken? In considering that, let us regard the circumstances: whether those circumstances were of such a character as to admit the possibility of mistake. In the first place, they did not expect Christ to die; in Luke 18:31, we read: “Christ took unto him the Twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on; and they shall scourge him and put him to death; and the third day he shall rise again. *And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.*” In the 24th chapter of Luke you have the case to which I called attention last night; verse 44 is a further amplification of it. He said to them — this is after his resurrection — “These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.”

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Chairman.—It is very evident that either my memory has utterly deceived me, or that Mr. Robert's memory has utterly deceived him. He said he had given you evidence, last night, that the writings were in current circulation at the time they were produced. Now I never heard him say when any one of the books was produced; I never heard him fix a date or an author in the New Testament, except the Corinthians, which he attributed to Paul; I never heard him fix a date or an author in the Old, except for the Book of Proverbs, on which he turned out to be utterly incorrect, attributing it to Solomon on the authority of Josephus, and then not fixing any date at all for its currency; I never heard him pretend to give you any kind of clue as to whom he supposed to be the several authors, or when he supposed anyone of the particular books to be issued; and I cannot help thinking that his memory must have entirely misled him, and that he never did, during his speech last night supply us with any one of those facts; and I will ask him not to imagine that something relating to the existence of Christians, which I do not dispute, is evidence of the authenticity and truth of every book in the Bible. I do not dispute the existence of the Mahomedans, but I should be very sorry to accept that as a proof of the authenticity and divinity of the Koran; I do not dispute the existence of the Buddhists, but I should be very sorry to accept the fact of their existence as clear and irrevocable evidence of the truth of any books they may put forward as sacred. And I must ask Mr. Roberts to begin by specifying with the first book of the Bible — the Book of Genesis — who it is that he says professes to be the author of it, when it is that he says it was issued, amongst whom he says it was issued, and to give some evidence from contemporary writers of its having been in current circulation at the time of its being issued. I say there is not a particle of such evidence to be found. But when he has done this with the Book of Genesis, I will take him through every other book in the Bible in the same way. And now I will ask him to be kind enough to just look at what he imagines to be evidence. He says, "I will quote to you a Roman Governor, Festus", and he coolly quotes the book of Acts to me. But he has got to prove the book of Acts before he is entitled to quote it here. If you are to demonstrate that the Bible is reliable from beginning to end simply because it says something there, well, then there is entirely an end to all discussion. Let him find this account of Agrippa and Festus in Roman history, with any record of these books, then I will grant there may be something in it; but the question we have got to discuss is not, "Did some man named Paul live?" the question we have got to discuss is not, "Did some man named Jesus live?" because both those facts might be true, and yet this book not be the authentic record of divine revelation. We must just please put the dots on the *i*, so that we may know what we are talking about. Well, Mr. Roberts stated that between the time of Christ's resurrection and ascension to heaven, Christ was on the earth six weeks, and he was good enough to refer me — not for that, but for another point — to the 24th chapter of Luke. I will ask him whether he can make anything like six weeks, or even one week, out of the period which is put in that chapter for the ascension of Jesus to heaven. I will grant that Mr. Roberts may be right, and that Christ may have been six weeks

on earth; then I will ask him, if Luke says that was not so, on his own statement Luke must be stating something not true, and the book of Luke cannot be a divine revelation. If Acts is right, Luke is wrong; if Luke is right, Acts is wrong; and, in any case, Mr. Roberts is wrong, because he has got to make both books right. Now, we will pass by the whole of the quotation from Professor Tyndall. I have a great respect for him; but Professor Tyndall's opinions on Atheism, or natural processes, have not the smallest relation to the question we have to discuss. I will pass by every reference, at present, to Tacitus or Pliny, because it does not corroborate a single portion of the statement Mr. Roberts has to make out, which is, "That the Scriptures are the Authentic and Reliable Records of Divine Revelation". There is nothing to prove that proposition in Tacitus, and there is nothing in Pliny. If there were ten times there what Mr. Roberts imagines exists there, it would not go one step to prove his position. Now, I will ask him to follow me a little in what I shall submit. I gave Mr. Roberts a large number of texts last night. He said six minutes was not sufficient to answer them; but he has had thirty minutes to-night, and he might have answered some of them. If he could not have dealt with the whole, he might, at least, have commenced. Quoting Pliny will not prove that the story of the Fall in Genesis is one consistent with God's loving-kindness and mercy; quoting Festus, or Pliny, or Tacitus, or anybody else, will not get rid of any of the tests as to God being angry when He should not have been angry, and repenting when He should not have repented, and changing when He should not have changed. All those texts I read to Mr. Roberts last night remain untouched. I suppose it will be fair to say that they have slipped his memory since, because he thought them of importance at the time. The reason he gave for not answering them was that six minutes was not long enough, and it was a very proper reason; but he has had thirty minutes to-night, and he has quoted Professor Tyndall instead of explaining the Bible. Now, if you please, I will press Mr. Roberts a little further upon the position he has now taken. He says that by "authentic" he means that the books were really written by the persons by whom they are professed to be written, and at the times they are professed to have been written. Now, so far as I am aware, the only sort of profession of authorship for any of the early books in the Bible is the heading in the English Bible to the first five books — the First Book of Moses, the Second Book of Moses, the Third Book of Moses, the Fourth Book of Moses, and the Fifth Book of Moses. I am not aware that Moses — supposing him to have lived — ever made any profession on the subject at all; but I will assume that Mr. Roberts means that *authentic* means that these five books were written by Moses. Well, then, I will trouble him to give me some proof of that; I will trouble him to give me some proof of the time that Moses wrote them; I will trouble him to give me some proof from some other author of the existence of the books about that time, because he says they were in current circulation. Then I will ask him who it is who professes to have written the Book of Judges, because I do not see any profession of authorship; I should like him to tell me the date at which he thinks that book was issued, and to show me

some evidence of its being in current circulation at the time he says it was issued, and then from that I will lead him through every one of the books of the Bible, and ask him whether, instead of all that being true, there is not very tolerable evidence, from some of the authors whom he has already used in this discussion, that the whole of the sacred books of the Jews were destroyed during their captivity, and had to be re-written. If he will tell us that that is so, then it would dispose of the whole of the position he has put to you; and I will press him still farther, that even when he has shown, which he never will, that each one of the books of the Old Testament was written by some individual, was published at a particular time, and was current from that time forward, he will not have gone one step forward then to prove they are a divine revelation; because no one doubts that the Koran has been current from the time of Mahomed, but it does not prove it to be a divine revelation, although Mahomed pretended it to be one, and a very large number of people believe it to be one. Then we have to do what I suggested last night — examine the book, and see whether the contents of it are consistent with the character which, under any fair definition of Deity, is to be attributed to Deity; whether the internal statements agree with themselves, and whether they agree with science. And I put some very flat contradictions last night to Mr. Roberts, not one of which he has touched to-night. Why did he not, when he was dealing with the resurrection of Jesus, say whether he believed it was one woman who went first to the tomb, according to one Gospel, or two, according to another, or more than two, according to another? and why did he not give us his reasons for accepting one and disbelieving the rest. He relies on the resurrection; but if the story be full of contradictions, how can it be God's divine revelation? Mr. Roberts has neglected all this, and made some speeches about matters entirely unconnected with it. Now, if you please, I will draw your attention to the New Testament, because it shows the utter recklessness of the language Mr. Roberts uses. He talks of this book (the Bible) representing the archives of the Jews. Now, evidently, he could not refer to the New Testament, because the Jews do not acknowledge a single page of it. Then I will say that, when you come to the New Testament, that of the Gospels attributed to Matthew, to Mark, to Luke, and to John, there is not a particle of evidence, not an iota of evidence, to connect any of the persons named Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, with any one of those Gospels; and until something is done of this kind, I say the Four Gospels cannot be shown to have been in existence at all before the year A.D. 150, that is 120 years at least after the alleged date of the death of Jesus; and until something of this kind is done, the authenticity question ought to be given up. And, then, even supposing this were done, Mr. Roberts has the whole mass of contradictions in the history of Jesus; and until they are cleared away, it is no use talking of outside testimony; you have got to get the inside of the book; let him explain the contradiction about the forty days, let him explain the contradiction about the woman who went to the tomb; let him explain the contradictions that I have pointed out as to the parentage of Jesus; let him deal with all these things step by step, and not say, "I have only six

minutes", and then, when he has the time, to leave it undone. Now, if you please, what is the case we are to take? As far as evidence goes, for to-night, a reiteration of two statements — one that there are Jews, and another that there are corrupt Christians. But, really, if that is to make any kind of evidence, the same kind of evidence can be pleaded in favour of every religious book of every people in the world, and you must do something much more definite than anything of this kind. I will tell you why I submit to you that the Bible is not a revelation from God, by God meaning — in the sense in which I gave it last night, a sense which has not been corrected — an omnipotent, an omnipresent, omniscient, an infinite, an eternal, an all-good person. When Mr. Roberts says that he means a primal creative energy, clearly the Bible reveals either something much clearer than that, or nothing at all; it reveals a God who could be seen, and who could not be seen; it reveals a God who knew everything, and did not know some things; a God unchangeable, continually changing; a God all-wise, repenting and grieving at the unanticipated failure of His plans; it reveals a God who was everywhere, but who lived somewhere above, and who came down occasionally. This is, I submit to you, the revelation of the Deity in this book, and it is no use making statements outside that until these are dealt with. I gave Mr. Roberts, last night, a mass of texts not one of which has been answered, and I will now give you several additional texts which seem to show to me that the Bible cannot possibly be a revelation from an all-good God. And I will take you first to the 21st chapter of Exodus. Last night I confined myself to matters of fact; now I am coming to matters of legislation. Mr. Roberts says the existence of the Jews is a fact in his favour. Now, here are the laws supposed to be given in a divine revelation for those Jews: "If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing" — this is in Exodus the 21st chapter and the 2nd verse — "If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the doorpost, and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him for ever". Now, I say that there is nothing divine in that, and I say it is not even human. The tendency of modern legislation and civilisation is to introduce a state of society exactly the opposite of that. I say that any half dozen men who were to pass such a law as that in any civilised community would be condemned as inhuman, would be execrated by the voice of to-day; and you cannot suppose that, in any age, that came from an all-good God which to-day's civilisation would reject. You say, "If a master give his slave a wife", why! that presumes that a master has a right to have a slave wife! a woman from whom he may breed a race of slaves, and that if the servant insists on his own freedom at the end of the time, that he is to go, and leave the wife and the children in the custody of the master;

and that if he loves his wife and children enough to stay with them, the reward he is to get for that, according to this book, is that he is to lose his liberty for ever. Now, I will give you next Leviticus, chapter 26, verses 44 to 46, because, while Exodus shows you how this legislation deals with the Jews, Leviticus shows you how the laws deal with the heathen. That runs in this way: "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with us, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever." That is the law as to the heathen; then it goes on to say that, "over your brethren the children of Israel ye shall not rule with rigour". And you have two distinct laws here, one affecting the Jews, from Exodus, another affecting the heathen: and God, according to Mr. Roberts, approves of slavery, thinks that people may buy and sell slaves, breed and get slaves, and keep slaves for ever. And I say, instead of that being divine, it is most inhuman; I say that doctrine made the most horrible slavery persistent in America; I say the consequence of texts existing like this was, that when William Lloyd Garrison wanted a Christian Church, to preach in, in Boston, on slavery, it was denied him, and he was obliged to have the only Infidel hall in Boston, because there was no other platform admitted to him. Samuel James May, a religious man, tells you how he was not allowed to preach in any of the churches where he had been formerly allowed to preach when he became secretary to the Abolition Society; and in Whittier's works you will find in one of his grandest poems a denunciation of the South Carolina clergy, where they held a demonstration in all their churches in favour of slavery. I say this slavery is a horrible doctrine, a wicked and damnable doctrine, which has cursed human-kind, and you can only defend it here to-night by telling me that this book came out in the childhood and infancy of the world, when people did not understand what freedom was. Its brutal and barbarous legislation has grown out of the character of its authors. It belongs to the far-off past. Now I will come to the question of legislation on difference of religious opinions. And I will take you now to Deuteronomy, chapter 13, verse 6: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; namely, of the gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth, thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shalt thine eyes pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die." Now I say that is a doctrine which an all-wise and all-good and all-merciful God would never preach to human-kind;

it shows a bigotry, it shows a weakness, it shows an indisposition to listen to reason. Why! what would even be the doctrine Mr. Roberts would advocate, as evinced by his opposition to me here? When he meets an Infidel, instead of his hand being upon him to stone him to death, he challenges him to debate, to persuade him out of the opinion he thinks erroneous, while, according to the authentic revelation, what he ought to have done was to have killed me. His humanity rebels against that, and he will have nothing whatever to do with it. Now, if that is so, is it not evidence that he cannot think that book an evidence of divine revelation? Then I will refer you to Numbers 31:17, as illustrating the sort of doctrine that God thought fit to recommend in cases of war. I hold the doctrine that all offensive war is bad. That war except in defence of liberty is never justifiable. I do not know how far anyone who believes in the Bible would agree with that. I suppose those who believe in the Bible would think that war is good, because war is so strongly recommended in the early part of it. Killing the people you quarrel with, destroying all their cities, butchering their men, wives, and mothers, only sparing the women, who would be the subjects of your lusts: I say that all that is provided for here. I will not read to you, as I might, but simply refer you to Numbers 31:17, and if it be challenged, I will read you thirty or forty texts worse than that. I say, while you find texts like that in the book, it is no use telling me something that Festus said, or something that somebody else ought to have said. Deal with the book itself, and clear its blemishes away. I will have to draw my friend's attention to the point raised by him last night on the question of chronology. He quoted, as evidence for the Bible, the Septuagint; he referred to some passage in Josephus, but did not read it. I have not looked at the passage in Josephus recently. If my memory serves me rightly — and I am not quite sure it does — Josephus vouches nothing more than a translation of the Pentateuch; and I do not deny that the rolls of the Pentateuch have been in existence for a very long period prior to the Christian era. I should be simply a madman to attempt to deny anything of the kind; but what I do deny is, that you identify the Pentateuch we have here with the rolls of the Pentateuch that did exist prior to the Christian era. I say that there is no Pentateuch roll which can be carried back earlier than the famous Darghestan roll; and I say that that comes nearly 600 years on this side of the Christian era by the contention of its best men — 580 odd years; and I urge to you that the very matter in dispute between Mr. Roberts and myself turns on this. I do not pretend it to be, like every other religious book, an outgrowth of different ages, of different men, of different peoples, bundled together without one reason for bundling it together, and which cannot be contended to be a complete, coherent book under any circumstances whatever. I do not contend that, from the time of Solomon forward, it may not be possible that every king recorded in the Bible may possibly have ruled; but that will not make out one iota of evidence against me. You have got to prove the facts that I challenge, and to explain the difficulties I submit to be explained; you have got to prove that the theories I impeach fit into

your doctrine of divine revelation, or you do nothing at all. Now we have got to the second night of this debate, and I submit to you that we have not got the shadow of a scintilla of evidence, because all that has been sought to be done is to show you that some people called Christians are in existence, which I do not dispute. Then we were told that all the Apostles lost their lives, and then Mr. Roberts thought some of them did not. Now, I will ask him to find a reliable account of the martyrdom of any one of them, and I will ask him even then how far he has advanced his proof, because there have been people martyred for every religion in the world. There have been martyrs for every heresy. Martyrdom is no voucher of the divinity of the book. I will show you that, when Jesus was in danger, his disciples ran away, and his most trusty disciple denied him over and over again. And I ask you, if Peter, who knew from heaven itself that Jesus was from heaven, denied him, how can you expect me to believe the Bible on Peter's authority — that authority even unvouched? I will not weary you at present with any examination of the New Testament, because, if we begin the subject, let us begin it at the beginning; and I will ask whether it is not true that each of the accounts of the Creation in the first and second chapters of Genesis contradicts the other? And I say the book is anonymous — you do not know when, or where, or by whom, it was written — and that you cannot prove that the Hebrew language existed at the time Moses lived; and, until you have done that, it is no use telling me the writings were in current circulation at the time they were supposed to be written and issued. Let us have the book of Genesis proved first, and my objections to the Books of the Pentateuch first. Then we will go on step by step, and get a little further. Has there been any attempt here to-night to show you that the objections I stated last night from the Bible are not fairly taken? I say, Not one. I will give you again the texts: Exodus 32:7-14, comparing that with Exodus 28:1, 32:28, 35; Numbers 23:19; 1 Samuel 15:29; Malachi 3:6; 2 Kings 20:1-11; 2 Samuel 24:15, 16; Genesis 6:6; 1 Samuel 15:11; Genesis 18:20, 21; Deuteronomy 8:2; 2 Chronicles 21:15. I commented on the horrible story of the God-invented Fall, I impeached the history of the humanity-destroying Flood, and not one of those points has been touched from the other side. (Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. BRADLAUGH.

Mr. Bradlaugh, you have admitted the reliability of the evidence of Tacitus and of Pliny to the fact that there existed a large Christian community at the end of the first century, and that they were the subjects of persecution? — I have not admitted the reliability of the quotation from Tacitus. I am inclined to think that the quotation from Tacitus is liable to impeachment. I think the letter of Pliny is a fairly historic document.

You admit the existence of a Christian community at the end of the first century? — I do not admit the existence of a Christian community at the end of the first century only; I think I can show the existence of what you call a Christian community prior to Christ.

But at all events after Christ? — And I say that the same community I think I can show before.

That is another point. It is sufficient for my present question that you admit the existence of a Christian community at the end of the first century? — I admit the continued existence of a community traceable back prior to the alleged birth of Christ.

My question does not relate — My answer relates to my opinion on the subject.

You must hear my question before you answer it. Do you deny that there existed at the end of the first century a Christian community? — I admit that the sect sometimes called Therapeutae, sometimes called Essenes or Essean, sometimes called by other names, is found prior to the time of Christ, as evidenced by Philo, and that that same sect, sometimes called Christians, and sometimes by other names, may be traced afterwards.

Then it did exist at the close of the first century? — And prior to the first century.

Did it exist at the close of the first century? — yes or no? — I can give no further answer.

You can say yes? — I must answer in my own way.

Why are you afraid to say yes? Having admitted there were Christians at the close of the first century, were there writings in circulation amongst them? — I have not the slightest evidence of any identifiable writings in circulation amongst the Christians to whom Pliny refers.

I did not say “identifiable writings”; I said “writings”? — I cannot speak of writings that cannot be identified, for I know nothing of them.

Yes; you might know of the existence of writings that you cannot identify, and I ask whether or not you believe there did exist writings in circulation amongst them? — If you will describe the writings I will answer you.

I purposely do not describe them. — Then I refuse to answer.

Then you refuse to say whether or not, in your opinion, there were any writings in circulation amongst them? — I refuse to give an answer which will not be of the slightest value.

Then you refuse to answer the question I put? — Give me something that I can identify in my mind, and I will tell you whether I have any evidence of the existence of that or not. I cannot answer on the vague word “writings”, because I

believe that ever since written language has been used, the people amongst whom the use of written language obtained have had writings.

Did written language obtain amongst the Christians? — Yes.

Did they have among them writings setting forth the facts of their religion? — I do not know.

In your reply to the Bishop of Lincoln you say: "In the early ages of the Christian Church, forgeries of Apostolic writings were common". I want to know if there were genuine Apostolic writings? — I never saw any.

Do you believe there were forged ones? — I believe that there was a huge multitude of forged writings, and that nearly nine-tenths at least have been abandoned by the Christians themselves.

Does that not prove the existence of genuine ones somewhere? I do not know that it does; I do not know that the existence of an imitation dragon proves a real one.

Do you mean to say that there can be a counterfeit coin without a genuine one? — Oh yes, if you will travel on the Continent, you will find a good many of them.

Do you mean to say that the idea of genuine coin does not precede the fact of counterfeit? — I do not know.

You do not know? — No.

I will be content with that answer. — What I do know is, that people who want to be dishonest will avail themselves of any means which they think will give effect to their scheme of dishonesty, and that is all I know.

Do you think the Apostles were dishonest men? — I don't know even that they existed; so I cannot call them "dishonest men".

Then what do you mean by forgeries of Apostolic writings? — I mean that there were writings which pretended to be writings of Apostles, when they were only forged writings by people who were not Apostles.

Were there such men as Apostles? — Of every faith; yes.

Of Jesus of Nazareth? — When?

In the first century? — I do not know.

May there have been? — Oh yes, and there may not.

Is it probable or not that they wrote? — I don't know. You say they were ignorant men; and they may not have known how to write.

One of them was not ignorant. — Which?

Paul. — I don't know anything about Paul.

I have in my hands a book — a compilation of Epistles, each of which begins with an introduction similar to this: “Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God unto the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints.” How do you disprove that Epistle? — It is not my business to disprove it; it is yours to prove it. I have read a letter supposed to be addressed by Jesus to a king. It is not my business to disprove those things: it is yours to prove them.

You have admitted that Eusebius is a historian who lived, and whose writings are to be trusted? — No; I have not. On the contrary, I have said that Eusebius lived and wrote; and I also said that he was a party to the issue of many forgeries.

Do you believe that he lived in the beginning of the fourth century? — Yes.

Do you believe that, living at that time, he had materials — better materials than either you or I have — of judging whether these were genuine writings or not? — I am quite sure that he *made* materials; and if you give me, as you have it, his “Ecclesiastical History”, I will give you instances of several that he made or circulated unjustifiably.

I refer my question to a particular point, to which I wish to call your attention. He lived 1500 years ago or thereabouts. My question is, whether or not you admit that at that time it was easier to judge — by reason of the great number of books then existing which have since perished — upon the question of whether these were authentic or not? — I don’t suppose so many books existed in the fourth century as now.

Then, do you deny he was in a better position than you to judge? — I don’t suppose that he was in so good a position, because I believe he invented some times. If you give me the writings of Eusebius you refer to, I will give you the evidence of my statement. I am not producing Eusebius; you are.

I am producing Eusebius in order to show that in his judgment these Epistles were written by the Apostle Paul and the Gospels written by those whose names they bear. — And I say that the statements in Eusebius will not prove that the Gospels were written by the persons whose names they bear; but, on the contrary, will, at least in one case, prove exactly the opposite, and, if you will lend me Eusebius, I will show you.

No, I will be content with your answer, Mr. Bradlaugh — content, ironically, of course, you understand. Do you think it probable that a community, or a movement which has given a religion to all the civilised nations of Europe, should have existed and effected that revolution without authentic writings? — Up to the year A.D.1000 the Christian religion had not given itself to Europe. The bulk of Europe up to that time did not accept it.

I am speaking of the present facts, the present day — 1876. — Then the present day proves no more than Utah, being full of Mormons, proves that Mormonism is true.

I am speaking of the existence of the book. — I do not deny the existence of the book to-day; it is sold at 4d. a copy.

A book is *prima facie* evidence of itself until it is disproved. — Then the book of Mormon is proof of itself until it is disproved.

And I shall be prepared to disprove it. — Do it.

One thing at a time. I ask you how you disprove that the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians was written by Paul? — That is not my business: It is your business to prove that it was written by him.

It is *prima facie* evidence of itself? — No; but it is not until you, by external evidence, have proved the authenticity of the book from which you quote; you have not the slightest right to read its contents as evidence against me.

Then you cannot get rid of this *prima facie* evidence? — It is not *prima facie* evidence. We disagree as to the meaning of the words.

The 1st Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians exists with a profession on the face of it that it was written by Paul: can you disprove that profession? — Then Mahomedanism is true, and the evidence is this: the Koran exists. Can you disprove the evidence of the Koran?

Yes. — Do it.

This is not the time. Can you disprove that? (Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians). — I have disproved the reliability of the Bible by quoting an abundance of contradictory texts from it.

The 1st Epistle to the Corinthians: that is my question. — I have no other answer to give to that.

Then you cannot disprove it? — My business is not to disprove every statement you make without evidence.

Here is the book; it is *prima facie* evidence of itself until it is disproved? — No, it is not. The book stating that a devil went into the pigs is not evidence until it is proved. You have got to show the evidence outside the books.

Then Mr. Bradlaugh fails in dislodging the basis of my argument to-night; he confesses his inability to disprove the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians as the production of Paul. — I have only said it is not my business. The moment you give any evidence of it I will answer that evidence.

Will it not destroy my argument if you disprove it? — But there is nothing to disprove: you have called no witness.

I have called the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians — You have not proved it in the smallest degree.

It is proved by the unanimous consent of a hundred generations. — So is the Koran proved by the unanimous consent of a hundred generations, and many a falsehood in the world by an equal number of generations.

And if they were not capable of being disproved, we should be bound to receive them; but they can be disproved. Can you disprove the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians? — Generally, on the Bible, I have tried to, and you have not answered one of the texts I have given.

You say it is not your business? — On the contrary, I say that the Book of Genesis contradicts itself, and that the Gospels contradict themselves; and until you answer that, your case is disproved.

MR. BRADLAUGH QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

Did I understand you last night to say that the chronology in the Septuagint differed from the chronologies in the authorised English version? — Yes.

Which chronology is true? — The Hebrew.

How do you know that the Hebrew chronology is more true than that in the Septuagint? — By a process of argument which would be too extensive to rehearse to-night.

I would like to have it. — I cannot do it in the time.

When will you? — In a lecture.

But now? — I have not time.

Do you mean that during the whole of the debate you will have no time to explain why you accept the Hebrew chronology, and reject the Septuagint? — With the immense argument I have to unfold, I do say I have not time.

Then, as you say that the Hebrew chronology is true, and the Septuagint chronology is not true, how do you account for a book, which you say was translated from a divine revelation, having an incorrect translation, at least as far as the chronology is concerned? — Because the translation was out of the custody of its safe and divinely-appointed keepers.

Who were the “safe and divinely-appointed keepers” of the original revelation? — I answer by quoting the Apostle Paul in the third chapter of Romans: “What advantage, then, hath the Jew? . . . chiefly because that *unto them were committed the oracles of God.*”

Will you be kind enough to show me any evidence prior to the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, when you say the Septuagint translation was made, that the “original revelation was in the custody of” its safe and divinely-appointed keepers? Who do you say were the custodians of these writings? Tell me where kept, the town they were kept in, and the people who, you say, had the custody of them? — That is rather an extensive question; break it up.

Well, name the town where they were kept, first? — Shiloh, first.

When were they kept in Shiloh? from what date to what date? — Just after Joshua's conquest of Canaan by the tribes of Israel.

Where shall I find any evidence of that? — In the Book of Joshua.

Will you kindly quote me chapter and verse for that? — Yes, I will (after turning over a Bible for some time): Judges 18:31.

Do you rely on that text? — Wait a moment; let me give you my answer.

Don't you know there is not a word about any of the books being kept in Shiloh in that text? — Yes; that is only a part of my answer.

But where have you any evidence that at, or about, the time of Joshua any books were kept in Shiloh? — This is the first part of my answer. My answer is not complete. I prove here that the house of God was at Shiloh. I will next prove that the house of God contained the ark, and that the ark contained the books of Moses.

I am content to accept any evidence. Give me some. — I will give you the evidence (referring to the Bible).

I say that there is not a particle of evidence of the existence of any books about the time of Joshua in Shiloh. — Then I will prove it.

That is what I want you to do. — Deuteronomy 31:24: "It came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee."

Where does that show that the five books you call the books of Moses were kept in Shiloh after the time of Joshua? — It shows that Moses commanded the Levites to put it there, and I must next prove that the Levites put it there. I ought to have begun by quoting the command of God to Moses.

I must ask you not to make speeches, but to give me the evidence. Please identify the book of the law with the five books? — I am dealing with the evidence to which I am alluding. In Exodus 25:16, we have the command that I ought to have quoted first — the command of God to Moses: "Thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee."

Exodus 25:16: I will read it: "Thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee". Will you show me how I am to make that prove that the first five books, which you call the Books of Moses, were kept in Shiloh at the time of Joshua? — And in Numbers 3:31 we have the duty of the priests to take charge of the ark and its contents.

Numbers 3:31: "Their charge shall be in the ark, and the table, and the

candlestick and the altars, and the vessels of the sanctuary wherewith they minister, and the hanging, and all the service thereof." How does that prove that the first five books were in Shiloh after the time of Joshua? — It establishes a line of evidence, which a critical mind ought to be able to see.

Oh! does it? — Yes. Well, I think I need not attempt at present to continue this.

Do you mean you have given all the evidence you can? — No. I will undertake, when I have time, to do it.

When will you undertake to do it? On which night of the debate? Choose your own night. — I had better promise generally — before the discussion is out.

But "generally" means no time at all? — I don't like to commit myself to anything I am not sure of doing.

Do you mean to say that you cannot do it? — I am quite sure of my ability to do it.

What date do you say was the date of Joshua? — As a man?

You have spoken of "Joshua". — Do you mean Joshua as a man or a book?

I mean it in the sense you have used it. — I have used it in both senses.

When you said the five books were in Shiloh about the time of Joshua, I want to know in years, *Anno Mundi*, what time you meant? — Well, I suppose it would be in round numbers, somewhere about 1,500 years before Christ.

"Somewhere about 1,500 years" before the Christian era. Is there a particle of evidence outside the Bible of the existence of Hebrew as a written language at that date? — The Bible is sufficient evidence.

Just answer my question: Is there a particle of evidence outside the Bible of the existence of Hebrew as a written language at that date? — Yes, there is.

Give it me? — I cannot — not now.

Will you undertake to give me that evidence any night during this debate? — You are putting on me rather too much work, Mr. Bradlaugh.

Oh! I will put on you more than that; that is only a trifle. Will you undertake on any night during this debate to give that evidence — yes or no? — The Bible is such good evidence that I undertake to produce no other, although I believe there is.

Why do you believe there is any other evidence? — From scattered information I have gleaned in general reading.

Where? — General reading.

Where? — Everywhere.

Name an author? — All authors who have written on the subject with whom I have come in contact.

Name one that you have come in contact with? — The question is so frivolous I refuse to answer.

Then under those circumstances I decline to put any more questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Roberts will now have a quarter of an hour's speech.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Bradlaugh occupied a considerable portion of his half hour's speech in reminding me of what he considered my failures. I have to remind him of what is a much greater failure on his part, and that is to deal with the positive argument in so far as I have unfolded it. I grant I have not yet conducted it very far; but, so far as I have carried it, Mr. Bradlaugh has not attempted to deal with it. Some of his difficulties I will deal with. At none of them am I frightened. In fact, I could like nothing better than a public test on this point in such a form as would admit of a thorough investigation. It is impossible, in the limit of six nights, conducted in this way, to go into the thing in that thorough, exhaustive, and critical manner that would be necessary for the full illustration of the whole of the bearings of the case. I am, therefore, obliged to content myself with a wise way of dealing with the question in a limited time — viz., the plan of seizing hold of those positive, unquestionable facts which Mr. Bradlaugh himself dare not deny, and which, when logically construed, yield the general conclusions for which I am contending, notwithstanding, all those little bits of exceptions which he was taking, and discrepancies which he was urging, as regards the general contents of the Bible. I will undertake, in a thorough legal investigation, in the presence of a judge — so to speak — in which Mr. B. shall question me for so long, and make a speech on my answers, and I question him, and make a speech on his answers, and so forth — I would undertake, under those circumstances, to deal with every single item that he can produce in the way of general discrepancy; and, under such circumstances, I would undertake that every single difficulty that could be brought forward would melt away in the process. But, meanwhile, it would be most unwise of me to go grappling with the difficulties before I have marshalled the general evidence before you. It is my business to present these evidences, and it is Mr. Bradlaugh's business to deal with my general demonstration of the positive case, instead of trying to drown my argument with little points, that are not in reality inconsistent with it.

Now, pursuing the general argument, I resume the thread which I was obliged to break, or to drop, at the close of my first half-hour's speech. I was then showing that the apostles did not expect Christ to die. I will now show that, being dead, they did not expect him to rise. In John 20:9: "As yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." I will next show that, when he did rise, they did not believe it in the first case — all of which goes to show that there was no predisposition in their minds to entertain any fantasy on the subject,

and that, therefore, the theory of hallucination relied on by those who deny the certainty of Christ's resurrection is inconsistent with the facts. The evidence on that point is to be found, amongst other places, in Luke 24:10, 11: "It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary, the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not." Then in Mark 16:14 we have this statement: "Afterwards he (Jesus) appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." How came they, then, not expecting him to rise, and not believing the testimony of those who had seen him rise; how came they to believe in the fact of his having risen, and to give their lives and their well-being for the sake of their testimony to that fact? The answer is to be found in testimony which I have partly quoted in the earlier part of the argument. Peter says — speaking of himself and the other apostles — "We did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." — (Acts 10:41). One case in particular illustrates the scepticism of the apostolic band as regarded the first report of his resurrection, and also illustrates the means by which that scepticism was dissipated, and a firm faith lodged in its place; and we shall see that it is a faith placed upon actual personal witness, and not at all upon any fantasy, such as might be supposed to be nursed in a heated imagination. In John 20:24, it is stated: "Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came" — that is, the time of his first interview with the ten disciples — "the other disciples, therefore, said unto him, We have seen the Lord; but he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hand the print of the nails, and put my fingers into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe. And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in their midst, and said, Peace be unto you! Then said he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God! Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed". In Luke 24 we find the whole of the apostolic band assembled together at an early period of the day of Christ's resurrection; and they are eagerly discussing the flying rumours they are hearing — first, the report of the women, afterwards, the report of Peter, to whom Christ had separately appeared, then the report of two of the disciples who went on a journey to Emmaus, and to whom Jesus made himself known. We are told in Luke 24:33: "The eleven were gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon! And they (the two who went to Emmaus) told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said unto them, Peace be unto you! But they were terrified and affrighted." Observe that, if this was a concocted story intended to

create the notion — the false notion in that case — that Christ had risen, when he had not, you would not have found all these statements about the disciples not believing, and about them being terrified, and so on. They suppose they had seen a spirit or phantom; they supposed it was not the real Christ. “And he said unto them, why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see: for a spirit” — a phantom — “hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb; and he took it, and did eat before them.” — (Verses 38-43).

Realise the facts, please, for they constitute an explanation of the great bravery of the apostles in their testimony afterwards, for which they gave their lives.

The Pharisees (Matt. 27:63), remembered that Christ had said that he would rise again after his death, and they asked Pilate to set a watch over his grave after his death, that there might be no doubt as to the fact of death having taken him and kept him, and, therefore, as to the fact of his being an impostor. What story have the Jews now as to the fact, which both Jew and Gentile admit, that the body of Christ was never found, but that the grave was empty? for all the people in Jerusalem at the time were witnesses to that. They say “his disciples stole him while the watch slept”. Do you believe that story, that the disciples stole the body of Christ? What object could they have in stealing away a dead body? How could they steal a body with a numerous guard assembled round the sepulchre? They were a scattered and demoralised band. Yet afterwards they appeared in Jerusalem, and declared Christ had risen.

Thousands believed their testimony. Why? Was it because these men, in a fervid and an earnest manner proclaimed their belief in what might have been an illusion? No; the personal witness of the apostles was only one element in the evidence that persuaded thousands of Jews and Gentiles throughout the whole of the Roman Empire that Jesus of Nazareth, crucified by Pontius Pilate, had risen. The New Testament account is that God confirmed the testimony of the apostles by granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands; and I call upon Mr. Bradlaugh to account for the wide-spread reception of their testimony, if that account or explanation of it is not the correct one. Not only were the apostles personal witnesses of the fact of Christ’s resurrection, but Christ endowed them with power to do things that constitute the confirmation of their testimony. God invited men to believe in the resurrection of His Son, but He did not unreasonably ask them to believe without evidence. He gave evidence; He placed the seal of His confirmation upon their testimony by fulfilling the promise Christ left them before his ascension. What promise was that? Before Christ parted from them he commanded them, we are told in Acts 1:4, that they should “not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which said he, ye have heard of

me.” What promise? Here is the promise: John 14:26; 15:26: “The Comforter, who is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you . . . When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.”

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I understand Mr. Roberts now to say that it is impossible for him to prove his case in six nights. Then he ought not to have challenged me to this debate. He says he could do it before a judge and jury. He selected his own tribunal — a public audience. He says that all the points I have taken would melt away to nothing when investigated one by one. Why does he not do it then, one by one? He has not touched one. He says he can do it, and yet he does not do it; and if he can do it, and does not do it, then he is guilty of not being loyal to the cause he is here to defend. Then he has referred to the texts, and still avoided the points; he actually referred to the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke again, and did not say a word about that text contradicting the texts in other gospels as to the number of those women. It is not debating to do that; reading a number of texts of Scripture without giving any evidence of them. The question to be debated is, “Are the Scriptures the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation?” and Mr. Roberts said that by “authentic” he really meant written by the persons by whom they professed to have been written, and at the times they professed to have been written; and when questioned as to books supposed to have been in existence 1500 B.C., he says that involves matter he is not prepared to give, when it is the very point he ought to have been prepared to state. You cannot say that when questioning him I did not wait with the utmost patience: I waited two minutes by the clock for one portion, three minutes for another, and two minutes and a quarter for another: I did not say one word; and he only said, when pressed for the evidence of his statement, that he was not prepared to give it. Asked for some evidence, he answers that I am pressing him too hardly. Pressed as to the authenticity of the first five books he does nothing. If he has not come to prove that, he came to prove nothing, and yet he has to confess, in answer to my questions, that on that point he is not prepared to answer. Well, then, he tells you that Gentiles and Jews admit that the body of Christ could not be found. Well, that is about as wild a saying as it is possible to give, and I dare him to produce me the writings of any Jewish Rabbi of any note at all containing any such admission. I do not pretend to be well read in Rabbinical writings; I have gone through a few volumes relating to them — not many, but I have not yet found a trace of an allegation of any such admission. I think I have read nearly every Christian evidence writing, and I have never seen a quotation from any Jewish Rabbi about anything of the kind, and I say it is utterly reckless — I do not mean it any way

unfairly, but only showing that there is an utter looseness and carelessness in this debate about the meaning of words. Mr. Roberts seems to think if he reads statements out of the Bible, he has proved those statements to be true, and then he asks me to explain the wide-spread acceptance of it. But the wide-spread acceptance of a doctrine does not prove it to be true. Buddhism and Brahminism are widely accepted, but that is no proof that they are true. As to Christianity, the "wide-spreading" of it was done by the sabre, by the rack, by the prison, by the fagot, not by the interal evidences of the book. I could quote you from Christian history, going from about the fifth century to the thirteenth, and show you that the people were induced to profess to believe this simply by killing them if they did not believe it. Every religion that has a large number of converts is wide-spread, and if that is evidence of the truth of it, the verdict goes by the majority, and as it is only the minority that believe Christianity, then Christianity is wrong. Well, now, let us, if you please, just see what we have really got; we have had in the last speech — I think I should be within bounds in saying — two-thirds of the quarter of an hour occupied in reading portions of the Bible, and not one reference during that time to the contradictions I had drawn attention to; although on the very question of the resurrection I had pointed out that there were contradictions as to the three days and three nights; also as to the women who went to the sepulchre, I pointed a distinct contradiction there; also as to the period Christ is stated to have been on the earth after his resurrection, I pointed out a distinct contradiction. All he tells you is what he could do in some other place and circumstances. But if he could not do it here, he should not have been here. Now, if you please, just see the position we are in; not one date alleged for the Book of Genesis, not one author tried to be proved for it; not one date alleged for the Book of Exodus, not one author tried to be proved for it; not one date alleged for the Book of Leviticus, not one author tried to be proved for it; not one date alleged for the Book of Numbers, not one author tried to be proved for it; not one date alleged for the Book of Deuteronomy, not one author tried to be proved for it; a statement, for which there is no foundation whatever, was made that in the time of Joshua these five books were kept in a place called Shiloh. When we have got some statement of that kind, of which there is not a particle of evidence here, then I shall want some proof of the place called Shiloh, and I think Mr. Roberts will find he has got his work to do there. And I shall want proof of any evidence in the world that there were manuscripts existing at that time; and I will show you, from the size of the ark, and the only fashion of record common to the country where the Jews were in the alleged time of Moses, that it would be simply impossible that you could have had anything of the kind. I said to Mr. Roberts, "Give some *prima facie* evidence", and he said, "O! I will do it some night in the debate; I am not quite sure I shall do it at all"; and I am sure you cannot do it at all. But that is what he ought to have done in his first speech. He has jumped over the whole of the Old Testament, and thinks that by reading from the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, that he proves the authenticity of the whole of the Bible. Why!

reading the Lord's Prayer will not prove the truth of the rest of the Book. Reading some story — and what have we had? a curious story; a story of Jesus appearing to two disciples going to Emmaus; while they could see him they did not know him, and directly they could not see him, knew him; and that is the best evidence he can give you. Why! if it were submitted to sane people as an event of to-day, only one verdict could be come to. How is this debate to go on? I am asked about the "widespread". Shall I deal with the "wide-spread", step by step? If you appeal to the wide-spread, I must take it as I find it; and what do I find this Church to be? I find it, in its earlier ages, to be a Church that made its way by fraud, by forgery, by assassination, and by perjury; I find it described by its own ministers as full of licentiousness and corruption; find that as it grew it incited wars all through Europe; took the side of king against people, and enslaving the people; I find it crushing out the possibility of education, and so destroying philosophy that it is only to the Moors we owe the preservation of great thought. If you want the spread, take the spread as it was through the centuries of gloom and ignorance, and the only gleam of light you will find in it is during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, when the bloody Crusades, and the ruined cities, and the burnt homes showed in bright relief the humanity of your Christianity. If you want the spread, take it in the early part of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; take it under John of Burgundy and Charles the Bold, and under Charles and Louis of France. Take it when the Church aided to destroy the toiling burghers of Dinant. Take it when the priests of this book cursed the city, when they stood by while the duke and king razed every house to the ground! You talk of divine revelation! In the names of the murdered women of Dinant I impeach the faith founded on it. I say the whole history of it has been a history of cruelty, of fraud and of crime, until civilisation, struggling out, despite the whole hindrances of your superstition, has purified your religion despite itself. I should have been content, if anything like evidence had been given, to answer that evidence; I should have been content, if texts had been examined, to go through text by text. I am told I have piled up a bundle of texts. Yes; and I could have made it tenfold. Instead of any answer, I am referred to the "wide-spread" of it! "Wide-spread" of it! Where will you take it to-day? Which is it? Rome, England, Nonconformists, Unitarians, Trinitarians? Do not tell me about the "wide-spread", when there are a hundred sects cursing and damning one another, and at the present moment preparing for war against one another right through Europe! "Wide-spread" of it! Why, if you want any proof that it is not authentic, it is that it has failed to dominate mankind in the interest of humanity; if you want any proof of it, it is that the clergy are obliged to admit that belief in this book is disappearing as education increases; if you want any proof that it is not a Divine revelation, it is that while this version is urged to you as God's only message to man, a committee are now sitting to make out a new one! Friends, I will not intrude any longer on your attention, because I have exhausted, within a minute or two, the time allotted to me, but I must ask you to bear with me while I point out

what my opponent ought to have done, and what he ought not to have done, because, practically, in the quarter of an hour to come, it will be divided into two short speeches. According to my friend's own contention he should have given you some evidence of the authenticity of the book. He has given you none. He should have been prepared to defend the morality of the book; but he has not answered what I said about slavery and murder, and the contradictions in the character of God; he has only read to you about Jesus being dead, and eating broiled fish and honey-comb when he was dead, and he apparently thinks that this passes in lieu of proof. And then he says it is impossible to do it in six nights. Then cease the debate at once; do not take six nights, and do not waste time in the unavailing attempt to do it. He says he can do it before a judge and jury, instead of which he is bound to do it before the tribunal he himself has chosen, a sensible and intelligent audience of Leicester men, who are able to form an opinion, and who will only have one verdict to give. [A pause.]

Mr. ROBERTS: I was only asking the chairman that I might have a quarter of an hour for the conclusion of my argument, but it seems we are pledged to close at 10 o'clock, and, therefore, I must submit to the partition of the remaining time. I have, therefore, to say that Mr. Bradlaugh has either misunderstood or deliberately misrepresented my argument about the wide-spread reception. I did not refer to the wide-spread reception of the Christian tradition in the 19th century: I alluded to the wide-spread belief engendered in the mind of the Roman public in the first century, according to his own admission, in the face of all manner of pains and penalties. And what I ask him to do is to reconcile that undoubted historic phenomenon with any notion of Christ's not having risen from the dead, and of the disciples expressly declaring what they believed to be — what they knew to be — not true. I will suppose a parallel case: I will suppose that the people of Leicester were to succeed in some way or another — not possible under our constitution, I admit—in apprehending Mr. Bradlaugh, and hanging him, and his dead body delivered upon under official attestation, and buried, and all the Secularists disheartened and squandered; and the Leicester Secularists are found a few weeks after holding public meetings in the Temperance Hall, Leicester, and saying, "Mr. Bradlaugh has risen from the dead"; and the magistrates say, "If you say that, you shall go to prison"; and they say, "Well, we shall go to prison; but we declare that to be true, for we have seen him; we are not speaking of a mere opinion of our own; we rest our declaration on personal experience". And suppose that, in spite of their imprisonment, in spite of their fining, in spite of the assassination of their leading members, these same Secularists go up and down the country, and proclaim that Mr. Bradlaugh has risen from the dead, and that thousands in this enlightened country believe their testimony, notwithstanding pains and penalties that Parliament should decree against the reception of their testimony; then I say that, in that case, you would afterwards have a great

historical problem to solve upon some rational principle; and if the facts of the case were equal to the facts in this other case, there would be no rational explanation, apart from the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh had really risen. In fact, the case could not occur apart from the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh had really risen from the dead, and that his followers had seen and conversed with him for a sufficiently long time to make it quite sure that they were not labouring under some hallucination of the senses. And these are the undoubted facts of this case; for Mr. Bradlaugh has admitted the existence of this wide-spread community in the first century, in days when they were persecuted, and attempted to be destroyed by all manner of evil agencies; the central feature of whose contention was that Christ had risen from the dead. I quoted from their authenticated writings, and my argument is not completed, and I am not able to complete it within the six or seven minutes that fall to my lot. Mr. Bradlaugh says I am away from the subject. Surely Mr. Bradlaugh will admit that if I prove Christ's resurrection, I prove him divine.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS: And if I prove him divine, I prove that his endorsement of Moses and the prophets is, in itself, a conclusive evidence of the divinity of these documents, apart from all abstruse and difficult questions connected with localities in remote times in which it is difficult almost to identify any place, particularly in profane records, and particularly as affected other nations. With regard to the Jewish nation, with regard to Jewish localities, with regard to Jewish events, there is more abundant identification, and more definite and circumstantial evidence, than in the case of any nation under heaven.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: No.

Mr. ROBERTS: Well, of course, Mr. Bradlaugh thinks not; but I declare that to be a fact, which even Sir Isaac Newton alleged to be a fact, as the result of his acquaintance with general literature, that no book of similar antiquity, and no event in history, are so well authenticated, in accordance with all the rules of evidence, as the New Testament and the resurrection of Christ. Mr. Bradlaugh has attempted to represent that I am speaking irrelevantly to the issue, whereas, if the facts I am contending for — which I contended for last night, which I have been contending for to-night, and which I shall contend for in the nights to come — if these are all established, which I am sure they can be, then my case for the Bible is proved, and all Mr. Bradlaugh's objections will be seen in the light of trifling minor and obscure issues, which fall in with and are governed by the incontestible body of evidence that proves the Scriptures to be "the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation."

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I have not admitted, and I carefully guarded my answer to prevent the possibility of such an admission, that there was a body of Christians in the first century believing in the story of Jesus as recorded in the gospels; for I

pointed out that the people called Christians were people whom I thought that I identified as existing before Christ, who, therefore, could not have held any such belief; and it is not fair, therefore, to say I admitted it. Hence, I say there is not a particle of evidence given to us, because the reading of the gospels is no evidence until it is shown who wrote the gospels, when they were written, where they were written, and that they did circulate, as Mr. Roberts says it is difficult to identify Jewish places. I did not ask him to identify them; he mentioned them, and he should not have mentioned a place he could not identify. Mr. Roberts says something of Sir Isaac Newton; but however good Sir Isaac Newton may be on some subjects, he is no good authority on Egyptian chronology or anything of the kind; because, during the last forty years, Bunsen has opened a field of inquiry of which Sir Isaac Newton and those who preceded him, were necessarily utterly ignorant. Then he says, if I were put to death to-day, and you folks went about saying you had seen me, would not that be conclusive? Well, but there is no evidence of anything of the kind having happened with regard to Jesus. Reading the gospels does not prove it. Reading the other day in the *Daily Telegraph* the story of the Sea Serpent, does not prove that the serpent stretched out thirty feet to bite a mast, more than twice the distance from the surface of the sea, and no sane person would pretend it does. You have got to verify the story before the story can be of the slightest value as to the facts it relates. Then, how do we stand now? Why, nothing whatever has been done. Mr. Roberts in his last speech says they conversed with Jesus for a sufficiently long period to make it clear. But the very period I have challenged as being contradicted in the gospels he quotes, and how can he pretend to keep repeating his statement until he has reconciled that? To say that every little thing can be cleared away, and not doing it, is simply to waste time with a mere verbiage of talk. He has not given me anything whatever to do in the way of reply, and I simply conclude my speech by thanking you for your attention, and by moving a vote of thanks to our chairman for having presided over us so impartially for these two nights.

Mr. ROBERTS having seconded the vote of thanks, the Chairman responded and the meeting closed.

Third Night,
THURSDAY, 15th JUNE, 1876,
IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM.

MR. GEORGE H. ST. CLAIR IN THE CHAIR.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, we are met together to hear a very important question discussed by two gentlemen very competent to discuss it. The question is, "Are the Scriptures the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation?" The discussion of this question was commenced two evenings ago at Leicester, but we shall scarcely be at any disadvantage on that account, inasmuch as separate points are to be taken up each evening. In the agreement made between the two gentlemen it is provided that Mr. Roberts shall lead off with a speech of half an hour's length on the affirmative, that Mr. Bradlaugh shall follow with a speech of the same length on the negative side, then that Mr. Roberts shall have the liberty for a quarter of an hour either of making a speech or of questioning Mr. Bradlaugh: Mr. Bradlaugh to give categorical answers, not making a speech himself, and afterwards Mr. Bradlaugh shall have the same privilege of questioning Mr. Roberts for a quarter of an hour. Thus we shall occupy an hour and a half of our time. For the remaining hour it is arranged that the speakers shall speak alternately for a quarter of an hour at a time. That will bring us to ten o'clock, and at ten o'clock the meeting is to close. You will perceive that this arrangement leaves no room for any remarks to be made by the chairman, and it leaves no room for any interruptions on the part of the audience. It is, indeed, very properly provided that should either disputant be interrupted the time thus wasted — and it will be utterly wasted — shall not count against him; the only result therefore would be to keep the entire meeting to an unnecessarily late hour. Those, therefore, who disturb the public peace will be in a sense enemies of us all. However, I anticipate no interruption; I address you as ladies and gentlemen, and I anticipate nothing but polite conduct on the part of all. I now call upon Mr. Roberts to open the discussion on the affirmative side.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am sorry that so far as this audience is concerned, we have to begin in the middle of the discussion. That is a form of things that I tried to avoid, but was not successful. By what may for the purpose of to-night be described as an awkward twist in the preliminary negotiations, I was compelled to consent to have two nights at Leicester out of six nights which I wanted at Birmingham. I do not now propose to occupy time in paying any further attention to that point, but I thought it necessary to allude to it

as a necessary recognition of the awkwardness which I feel to some extent you are placed in and I also. In order, however, that there may be as a little disadvantage as possible resulting from that circumstance, I will indicate in a sentence or two, so far as that can be done, what has taken place at Leicester.

On the first night I began the argument, at the date at which we were assembled, and contended that the circumstances existing in the world at the present time are such as ought to exist if the Bible be true, and that the evidence that ought to exist of the early existence of the Scriptures if the Bible is true, does exist; that there is ample evidence of the authenticity of these books which constitute the New Testament, upon which I contended the Old was also proved. Last night I argued that that great revolution in the history of mankind which occurred 1,800 years ago, by the general consent of all men, cannot be accounted for upon any rational principle apart from the account given in the New Testament, and that is that Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified by Pontius Pilate, rose from the dead, and spent a certain length of time with his friends, and then left them with a promise to return, and afterwards endowed them with power to give evidence of the truth of their testimony in the working of miracles.

All that Mr. Bradlaugh has done hitherto has been, first, to neglect my general argument, which perhaps he did not quite comprehend, and secondly, to try to divert me from it by calling my attention to a number of discrepancies in detail, which certainly I admit at the right time ought to be capable of reconciliation with the general argument, but which it is out of my power, in the rehearsal of that general argument, to notice meanwhile. He demanded that I should first prove when and by whom the book of Genesis was written, when and by whom the book of Exodus was written, when and by whom all the other books were written; but I take a more sensible plan. When I wish to cross to the other side of a river, I begin by walking on this end of the bridge; and I began to step towards the other bank by lifting my feet in 1876, and marching downwards to the first century; and we have got there, and we are there to-night, and I have to-night to call your attention to what I shall contend to be the most unanswerable evidence of the resurrection of Christ that can be produced. I refer to the case of the apostle Paul.

The apostle Paul is a man whose individuality stands out more distinctly from the dark background of antiquity than almost any man of similarly remote times, with the single exception, perhaps, of Jesus his master. We not only have his biography written clearly, concisely, and distinctly, by a fellow-voyager of his, but we have a compilation of authentic letters of Paul, written under a variety of circumstances, and dealing with a variety of matters, in which even the minute shades of his character and tendencies are visible. Mr. Bradlaugh chose to deny the authenticity of them, he did no more. I asked Mr. B. to disprove them; he said that was not his business; and as a matter of fact, he has not done it. Therefore I am entitled, in to-night's argument, to assume it as an undisputed thing that these letters of Paul are Paul's letters, being *prima facie* evidence of themselves, until

they are set aside, and I am certain Mr. Bradlaugh cannot set them aside, as will be manifest to you in the course of this evening's discussion.

Upon that basis, then, I introduce to your notice Saul of Tarsus. In what character do we first find him? We find him an enemy of the Christians. In the 7th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we read that Stephen was slain for his testimony to the resurrection of Christ — stoned by the Jews and (58th verse), “the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was Saul”. We next find him not only passively endorsing or sanctioning the destruction of the professed believers in the resurrection of Christ, but we find him taking very active and energetic steps to compass that end. In the 8th chapter and the 3rd verse, “Saul made havoc of the church, entering into every house and hailing men and women, committed them to prison.” In Acts 9:1, “Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogue, that if he found any of this way” — that is, believers in Christ — “whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem.” That is the testimony of one who was afterwards a companion of Paul in his journeys. I will now produce Paul's own confirmation of these statements: I will give you Paul's own declarations as to his previous career. In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, verse 13, he says: “Ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jew's religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and wasted it, and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.” Again, in 1st Timothy 1:12: “I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry, who was before a blasphemer and a persecutor.” In Acts 22:3-5, you have this account delivered by Paul in an address to a very large and turbulent, but for the moment quiet, assembly of Jews assembled around the foot of the castle stairs, whom he had permission to address at the moment of his apprehension by the Roman governor of Jerusalem:— “I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day; and I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women; as also the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders, from whom also I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damascus, to bring them who were there bound unto Jerusalem, to be punished.”

Now, the man of whom these things are authentically declared, afterwards became one of the most energetic, indomitable, enterprising and successful apostles and a preacher and defender of the faith which he formerly destroyed. No sane man will deny that; and here is the question, How came about that great change? If Paul had been convinced by argument, I would not attach any great

weight to the change, because the change in that case would merely indicate a change of his conviction, and would not be a guarantee of the correctness of his convictions. But was he changed by argument? Let us see. Surely such a man is able to give us a reasonable account of so great a change; and when he stood a prisoner before that extensive assembly of his fellow-countrymen at Jerusalem, his particular business was to explain to them how it was that he came to be changed; and I will read you his account.

Before I do so, let me remark that when you come to realise Paul's character, you will find that he was not a man that could be changed by anything short of the evidence of his senses in the particular circumstances in which he was a persecutor. He must have been a witness of the miracles of Christ, as an inhabitant of Jerusalem and a disciple of Gamaliel, a leading Pharisee; but in common with the rest of the Jews, he would see, in the crucifixion of Christ, a complete evidence of Christ's imposture, and a reason why he should refer the miracles of Christ to the supposed magical power to which they ignorantly referred them. This man, who resisted all the evidence displayed in the life of Christ while on earth, changed in the manner I have described, and the mere fact of this change is presumptive evidence that some powerful cause must have produced it. Paul himself explains the cause, and this is his account of it, in the 22nd chapter of Acts, verses 6-16: "And it came to pass", says he, "that as I made my journey (on the persecuting errand before referred to), and was come nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest. And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid, but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? and the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus. And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there, came unto me, and stood, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him; and he said, the God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know His will, and SEE THAT JUST ONE, and shouldest *hear the voice of his mouth*, for thou shalt be his witness" — *his witness*: it is not a matter of opinion; it is not a matter of "religion". Mr. Bradlaugh, last night, talked of the number of the Brahmins being an evidence of the truth of their religion. I don't argue that way about this matter. I say this is no matter of religion, so-called; it was not a matter of theory which Paul was called upon to embrace. It was a matter of fact of which he was allowed to be a personal witness: the fact of the existence of Christ who had been crucified. It is, therefore, a question of evidence we have to consider; a matter of fact; a matter of logical induction from very definite premisses: "Thou shalt be his witness unto all men of

what thou hast SEEN AND HEARD. And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins”.

Now, from the record of that transaction, it transpires that Paul saw Christ and not merely something from which he inferred his presence. Ananias expressly speaks of his “seeing that just one”. The fact appears more clearly from one or two other points to which I will direct attention in the 26th chapter of Acts, verses 15 and 16. Paul upon this occasion gives another address upon the same subject, and like all truthful men who are detailing a truthful matter, although he substantially tells the same things, it is not told in the same words; though if this book were a concoction or an imposture, very great care would have been taken to make the story exactly the same whenever told. “I said, Who art thou, Lord? and he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest; but rise, and stand upon thy feet, for *I have appeared unto thee* for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness to both of THESE THINGS WHICH THOU HAST SEEN, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee.” And afterwards Paul, alluding to it in the 15th chapter of the 1st Corinthians, verse 3-8, in combatting an objection which had arisen in the minds of certain living at Corinth on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, says, I first preached unto you “how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles; and last of all *he was seen of me also*, as of one born out of due time,” that is to say his apostleship was late in its date, because strictly speaking they only could be apostles who answered to the description which you find in the 1st chapter of Acts, when they came to appoint a successor to Judas, where this is defined as the necessary qualification — (verse 21): “Of these men which have *companied with us all the time that Jesus went in and out among us*, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be WITNESS *with us of his resurrection.*” As Paul was appointed after all these things, he declares of himself that he was as one born out of due time. But he had the essential qualification of having seen the Lord and thus enabled to give personal witness to the fact of his having risen. This is the strong point of his testimony: “*he was seen of me also*”. Now, those of Mr. Bradlaugh’s way of thinking may be disposed to laugh at this, but, remember, that one man’s evidence as to what he has seen and heard is as good as another man’s evidence, and better when his evidence is supported in so many collateral and powerful ways, as it is in the case of Paul. Paul’s seeing Christ was not a matter of isolated curious experience. It was followed by a career of forty year’s length, during which Paul’s particular business was to declare these things and to apply them in a definite manner for the eternal benefit of those by whom they were received; for doing which work, recollect, he “suffered the loss

of all things.” This is a strong confirmation of his testimony of having seen Christ. His declaration in writing to the Philippians, to which I also now call your attention, is this — and judge ye whether this is the language of an impostor or an ignorant enthusiast, or a literary forger, which the author of Philippians must have been if Paul did not write it. Referring to his previous career, in Philippians 3:4-8, he says: “Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more; circumcised the eight day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the Church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, *for whom I have suffered the loss of all things*, and do count them but dung, THAT I MAY WIN CHRIST.”

Let me also read you his description of the general position of the apostles in the world at that time; and judge ye whether it was such a position as men of sinister aims could possibly be brought to take up. In 1 Corinthians 4:9-13, he says, “I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death; for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men. We are fools for Christ’s sake, but ye (Corinthians) are wise in Christ; we are weak, but ye are strong; ye are honourable, but we are despised. Even unto this present hour, *we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and labour, working with our own hands*; being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it, being defamed, we entreat; we are made *as the filth of the world and are the offscouring of all things unto this day*.” Now a man who was educated at Jerusalem, of a high parentage, and with splendid opening prospects before him, who should suddenly rush into a career leading to such results, must be held to have had some rational reason for doing it. Paul’s reason is rational. There is no other reason admissable in his case. Let me ask Mr. Bradlaugh to tell us what he thinks was Paul’s reason, and I will then examine it. Mr. Bradlaugh cannot give a rational account of Paul’s case. He can only say he has no evidence there ever was such a man, which is simply shutting the eyes to the clear beams of truth.

But the case for Paul does not rest entirely upon the facts I have rehearsed. There are other strong confirmatory elements when we come to look into it. Paul not only went before Jews and Gentiles and presented his personal testimony to the resurrection of Christ, but certain things transpired in connection with the presentation of that testimony which we shall now have to consider. We are told that “God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul” — (Acts 19:11). I submit the evidence of it; 1 Corinthians 14:18-19: “I thank my God, *I speak with tongues more than ye all*,” says he, in writing to the Corinthians. He says this in the course of an argument tending to depreciate the importance of speaking with

tongues. Let me read it to you, as it is an illustration of the great good sense that characterised this man: "I thank my God I speak with tongues more than ye all: yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. Brethren, be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men". What does he refer to when he refers to that "speaking with tongues"? You will find an answer in the second chapter of Acts, which I intended to call attention to last night; but which I was prevented from doing for want of time, but which will come in appropriately at this point of the argument. You will see by reference to that chapter that the apostolic "speaking with tongues" was not the sort of gibberish which passes current in certain holes and corners in our day for "tongues". Hear the definition of them (Acts 2:1): "When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance . . . Now when this was noised abroad the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man", — every man of the multitude spoken of in the 5th verse: "devout men out of every nation under heaven", — "every man heard them speak IN HIS OWN LANGUAGE." And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to another, "Behold, are not all these which *speak* Galilaeans?" not only Galilaeans, but illiterate fishermen, who knew no tongue but their native dialect — "And how hear we every man *in our own tongue, wherein we were born?* Parthians, and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, WE DO HEAR THEM SPEAK IN OUR TONGUES the wonderful works of God." Therefore this speaking with tongues in the apostolic days was no matter of gibberish; it is no matter of what is understood in our day by "unknown tongues": the *tongues* spoken in those days were "known"; they were the spoken languages of mankind. And therefore the question to be answered is, how came illiterate men, without previous instruction, to be able in a moment to speak the current languages of mankind? Paul says, "I thank my God that I speak with tongues more than ye all", yet he counts it as a matter of little importance, which shows how real an experience it was in the apostolic day; for men don't talk this way about a thing that is not happening. If it was real, it was miraculous; and if miraculous, we have another evidence of the truth of Paul's testimony of Christ's resurrection: for these miracles were expressly declared to be God's confirmation of the testimony of the apostles. Then beside the speaking with tongues, we have other miracles. In Acts 19:11 we read: "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the

diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them". Again, Acts 16:25: "And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God"; this is when they were made prisoners for teaching the word of God, "and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bonds were loosed." In Acts 13:9-12, you have the account where Paul struck with blindness a man who was opposing him before the Roman deputy. In Acts 14:8-10, you have a case where he cured a man who was crippled from his infancy, in consequence of which the people of the city wanted to do him and his companions the honours supposed to be due to the gods, which they declined, saying that the works done were not their works, but done by God through them in attestation of the fact that His Son was risen and was offered to all men for faith, that they might obtain forgiveness of sins and a title to another and a glorious life, which Christ is to develop upon the earth at his second coming.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts has been good enough to sketch to you what has happened on the previous two nights of this debate, but his sketch lacks one or two features which I will take the liberty of supplying. The question for discussion and the point that Mr. Roberts ought to try to prove is that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation; and in answer to a challenge from myself Mr. Roberts said that by authentic he meant really written by the persons by whom they professed to have been written, and at the times they professed to have been written, and said that there was evidence that the writings were in current circulation at the time they were produced. He has not given a particle of evidence, either on the two previous nights or to-night, in favour of any one person as the writer of any one book. He has asked me to disprove that some epistle was written by some man whom he calls Paul. His business is not to ask me to disprove it, but to prove it to you, and my business is simply to wait for his proof, and then examine it. If I know nothing whatever on the subject, that doesn't prove that Paul wrote the epistle: his business is either to prove them or to say nothing about them. Then he is good enough to say something about the books not being the works of impostors. He ought to have told you that I had said that I do not maintain, that I never pretended to maintain, that the Bible, as represented in the authorised English version, which Mr. Roberts tells me is what he is content to be bound by in this debate; I have never pretended that that whole book is the work of some men designedly intending an imposture. I have always pretended and do pretend, that like many other mythic books it is an out-growth of different ages, the work of different men and at different times, full of their blunders when they blundered, full of their crimes when they were criminal, having their poetry if they were poetical, but simply expressing the men and the age out of whom it came. (A voice: ha! ha!) The gentleman who thinks that ridiculous has afforded us the weight of his testimony to the truth of the divine revelation, and I am sure it is the most valuable piece of evidence I have listened to in this debate here. And now

you must do me the justice to say that our friends did not begin any of that interruption. I asked Mr. Roberts whether that could be a divine revelation which, professing to state the character of Deity, contradicted every fairly assumable attribute for Deity, and I read a number of attributes which, with one exception, were thoroughly agreed to by Mr. Roberts; viz., omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, including foreknowledge, infinity, eternity, personality — I added another — all-goodness; to that Mr. Roberts objected, not to the attribute of all-goodness, but as saying that he did not mean to bind God with the meaning of the word goodness as usually applied to man. I did not gather from him any sufficient meaning in lieu of it; that might have been simply my fault, but with that exception we were agreed. And I drew his attention, not simply to discrepancies of detail, but I drew his attention to Exodus the 32nd chapter, verses 7 to 14, where the Lord says unto Moses, “Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation;” and I asked whether, in that which professed to be a revelation from an all-wise and all-powerful God, we could fairly expect any language of that kind at all. I drew his attention to verse 35, and to chapter 28, verses 1-3, and showed that by those verses God was appointing Aaron a priest at the very time He knew that Aaron was misleading His people, and that God punished the people because they did the sin which Aaron had done, whom God had appointed to be their leader; and I asked him whether this was consistent with any notion of a revelation from God. I took him to the case in 2 Kings 20:1, where He says to Hezekiah, “Thou shalt die”, and afterwards, on Hezekiah praying to Him, relents, and doesn’t kill Hezekiah at all, but lets him live. I took him to a variety of texts: Numb. 23:19; 1 Sam. 15:29; Malachi 3:6; which represent that God does not repent and that God does not change. I took him to where He repented of having made Saul king, 1 Samuel 15:11; and 2 Samuel 24:15-16, where God punished a people for the crime of their king, and then repented Him of the evil He was doing. I took him to Genesis 6:6, where God repented that He had made man, and it grieved Him at His heart. I took him on the point of omniscience to Genesis 18:20-21, and pointed out to him that the story had reached God in Heaven, that He did not know whether it was true or not, that He had come down to find out; and asked him whether that was consistent with omniscience. I took him through the same story, and showed the whole trick of bargaining with Abraham as to the preservation of the people in the doomed cities. I took him to 2 Chronicles 32:38, and Deuteronomy 8:2. I took him from these to the abhorrent cases of legislation in Exodus 21:2-6, where it provides that a slaveowner may give to a Hebrew slave a wife, and that when the seven years of servitude are up, that if the slave have begotten children by that wife he is to leave his children behind him and go away by himself; and if he wants to remain with them, as a penalty for that he is to be made a slave for ever; and I also referred to Leviticus 25:44-46; and I pointed out that while these doctrines applied to the Jews, for the pagans there was a never-ending slavery: “Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever.” I took him to the war commands of Numbers 31:17, and pointed out that while the tendency

of all wise men to-day was towards peace, this represented a God full of blood and murder, authorising the killing of every man, of every woman who was a mother and wife, and only sanctioning the saving of women who were not wives for purposes so horrible as to shock all right-minded persons, and which are yet imagined to be legalised by God. (Hisses.) If you dare not listen to your own Bible you have the fullest evidence that it is not authentic. I took him to the whole story of the fall, as depicted in Genesis, and asked him how God could be imagined as inventing a damnation-trap in which to catch the whole world. I took him to the story of the deluge, and asked him whether it was consistent with the attributes of God, as we have them, that He should convert the whole world into a slaughter-house, when he was omnipotent enough to have reformed it. I took him to the case of Jacob, the thief, the liar, and the cheat, who was loved by God either because of, or despite his rascality, and to Esau, the one who when strong forgave his mean brother, who nevertheless was hated. I took him to the case of David, in 1st Kings 11:33, 34, 38; and 14:8, where is spoken of as having kept God's statutes all the days of his life, and as never having done anything wrong; and I pointed out that he was a murderer, a traitor, a liar, a thief, an ungrateful scoundrel, betraying to death the subjects of the king who sheltered him. I asked whether this was a picture of an authentic revelation. Well, those were a few of the little discrepancies. And not one of these having been answered, Mr. Roberts says, if he had time he could, if he had time that he could melt them away one by one, but he has not tried the melting process yet: not one of them has been touched, and nearly the whole of them were put forward in my first speech on the first night. He has quoted Acts, but until he proves when the book was written, where it was written, by whom it was written, that it was current at the time to which the events it refers to relate, according to his own statement he has no right to read the book of Acts to me at all; because to say, I will prove to you that the Bible is an authentic and reliable revelation of God, simply by reading his statements, is the funniest fashion of conducting a debate I ever heard of in my life. Then Mr. Roberts says this evening, Oh! I will refer to Paul and to the resurrection, but he did not tell you that when he had quoted from Acts the night before last, about Jesus having been seen for forty days, and curiously, he did not mention the forty days: he said "for a certain time" to-night, that I quoted from the last chapter of Luke a statement utterly impossible to be reconciled with that forty days. Why doesn't he touch that? Then when he deals with the case of Paul, he says Paul, as a truthful man, don't recite it in the same words. But it is not the question, Is Paul a truthful man? but "Are the Scriptures the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation?" that is, did God, who could not make a mistake at all, send this message to humankind, or is it simply the work of men who may have blundered? Then in the discrepancies I gave I gave him the whole history of Jesus himself, born without a father, whose mother's husband had two fathers born in the lifetime of Herod and not born till after Herod's death, who was in Egypt and Judea at one and the same moment, known and not known by John at the same

moment, in the grave three days and three nights, between late on Friday evening and before Saturday was over. These are the discrepancies he says he can answer at the proper time and place, but surely the time is now and the place is here. If not, then I don't understand what a debate is. I submit to you that merely to go on reading texts out of this book until the book has been disproved is a most absurd thing. What does Mr. Roberts say to-night? Oh, he says, "I began at 1876 and got back to the first century." He did nothing of the kind: he jumped from 1876 to somebody he called Clement of Rome, and whom, without proving, he quoted as a thorough authority. He lumped with him Clement of Alexandria and another, and spoke of those writings "in those days", and I ask whether that is a fashion in which proof can be conducted. We must take the Old Testament first, and show you at any rate who he pretends was the writer of each book; he must show you at any rate when he pretends each book was written. I am not using the word pretend in any unfair sense; I am only using it in the sense of the contention he has got to make out in this case. He must show you where he thinks the books were in custody; and last night he contended that the five books of Moses were in custody at Shiloh during the time of Joshua, but he gave no evidence, quoted no texts, and would not even promise that he would find them at all for me.

Mr. ROBERTS: I did promise I would.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I did not interrupt Mr. Roberts at all, and I have a splendid memory.

Mr. ROBERTS: I merely avail myself of the Parliamentary right to speak to a question of fact. I merely say I did promise, and I will fulfil my promise before the discussion is out.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: When? On which night of the debate will he fulfil his promise?

Mr. ROBERTS: Next.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: On the next night of the debate Mr. Roberts is here to show that in Shiloh, in the time of Joshua, he can prove that there were five books kept that are called the five books of Moses. Now that is a step; the only pity is, that as he made the statement, he was not prepared with the proof of it at the time. I will show that there is not a particle of such proof existing anywhere, and it won't be enough to give loose texts from different books; we must have proof of the books, from which the texts are quoted before they can be used as any evidence against me. It is not enough to bolster up one position of a book with a declaration from another until you have verified the portion of the book from which you use the declaration.

Now, if you please, we will carry this a little further. Mr. Roberts asks, What explanation will I give of Paul's reasons. First, I know nothing about Paul; reading about Paul from the Acts of the Apostles is no evidence to me until the Acts of the Apostles are proved to me. How are they to be proved? The question

is, Are they authentic? What does *authentic* mean? Were they written by some people at some time? Were they current literature at the time they profess to have been written? And when Mr. Roberts has given the evidence of that in relation to the Acts of the Apostles — and I deny that he can show the Acts of the Apostles to be in existence within one century after the time of the alleged death of Jesus, and if that be so the whole burden lies, not of disproof upon me, but of proof upon him. And curiously let us see the kind of reading you have had from the texts: you have had reading from the 22nd chapter of Acts, but what Mr. Roberts should have done was this, not simply to tell you that the language did not agree, but that there was positive contradiction of fact. In Acts 9:7 it is said, “The men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice but seeing no man”; and yet when he comes into Acts 22, he will there find “They that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid, but they heard not the voice”. Now which is true? Is it true that they heard it, or that they did not hear it? Don’t say that Paul made a mistake; it is God who made a mistake if this is God’s revelation to man; this is the point to deal with. If Mr. Roberts will admit that the people who have written in this book have blundered over and over again, if he will admit that there are many matters of detail entirely incorrect, if he will admit that the book is on a level with any ordinary book, I shall know with what I am dealing; but his contention is that “the Bible is the authentic and reliable record of divine revelation”. Now, is it true that the people heard the voice or that they did not? is it true that they stood up or fell down? Can it be pretended that these contradictory statements are divine revelation? Then I will ask you just to consider what he says: he says one man’s evidence as to what he has seen and heard is as good as another’s. But we have got to get the evidence first, and we have not got it, and reading a statement from an unverified book is not evidence; and besides, one man’s evidence as to what he has seen and heard is not as good as another’s: it depends on the ability of the man to judge of the facts of which he gives evidence. Some men can note more accurately and state more clearly what they note; for example, suppose a man comes to you and says I made a journey across the Atlantic in the *City of Berlin*; when we were half-way across a big fish swallowed the whole ship, and I alone ultimately escaped from the belly of the fish; the man’s evidence is not good, because it contradicts all experience and all probabilities, the whole story outrages all experience, and the moment a man makes such a statement you condemn it at once. And yet when Mr. Roberts comes here and says that somebody saw the invisible God, oh! that ought to be believed, and that is to be something you are to accept! The Bible says “no man hath seen God at any time.” O yes, Abraham saw Him; Paul saw Jesus, who was either God or was not — I don’t know which contention Mr. Roberts will make, and don’t much care — what I submit is that the testimony to events which contradict all experience, the testimony to events which are alleged to be outside the range of all experience, is not testimony which you accept in the same fashion as testimony which you are entitled to examine and testimony which you are entitled to weigh. And I will ask

Mr. Roberts frankly to take up the points I have dealt with. On the first night of the debate, when I read nearly the whole of those texts, all except four, he said, Oh! six minutes is not enough to deal with those texts. I said, at any rate you might have done one of them. He told us he had gone through 144 contradictions issued by a society in America, but his business was to go through the contradictions I state, but this has not been done. Last night not a reference, to-night not a reference; and I ask whether it is not simply a sham of a debate to allow these things to go on, and to make no effort at all to answer them now. I submit that if the book contains statements inconsistent with the character of God as omnipotent, inconsistent with the character of God as all-good, inconsistent with the character of God as omnipresent, inconsistent with the character of God as infinite and eternal, then I say that book cannot be a revelation from a Deity having such attributes; and I say it is not enough for Mr. Roberts to say disprove this or disprove that, because the whole burden of proof lies upon himself. He is the challenger in this debate; he has undertaken to prove it; it is he who should have brought his evidence here. I have not seen one particle — one atom of it yet. I don't know whether I shall during the continuance of this debate, but, at present, the whole case on the other side is utterly unproved. Mr. Roberts tells you I referred to the Buddhists and Mahommedans; but I will tell you why I referred. He talked of the spread of Christianity, and then I had a right to answer him by the spread of other religions. Oh! he says, I don't mean the spread now to-day. But in his very opening, he had referred to Christianity as existing in 1876, and I had the same right to go back through it step by step, and show what it had been, and that is what I did; and I showed that while it pretended to be founded on this book as a divine revelation, that it had been productive of murder, of wickedness, of licentiousness, of ignorance, of poverty, of tyranny, of serfdom, and of keeping down people during the whole time that it had obtained power in the world. When Mr. Roberts talks of his first century proofs, he must remember that, at the present moment, I dispute them all, and that I have not had submitted to me the evidence on which I am bound to receive them. To tell me that I am to account for Paul until Paul is proven is the most absurd nonsense. He says that Paul suffered; where is the evidence of Paul suffering? In the Acts. You are going to prove Paul from the Acts, and the Acts from Paul. Well, if that is not turning all debate topsy-turvy, abandoning all reason, then the English language has no meaning whatever.

Well, is there any other evidence I need trouble you with? Yes; that every man spoke in different languages; and he proves that by referring to the Bible. And then he says they were ignorant men. Where is the proof that they were ignorant? How can you even identify the men at all? You have no right to open the book and quote a line from it to me until you have said that this book was written so and so, was in the custody of such and such people, at such a time. Submit to me that evidence, and let me examine it, and then, perhaps, you will be entitled to read the book. But, then, I am entitled to go through it, and to show you, that instead of

being a book full of love and kindness and goodness, like every book representing the religion of the past, it is full of the barbarities of the past, full of the cruelties of the past, full of the mischiefs of the past, and full of the ignorance of the past. I sit down saying, that up to this, the third night of the debate, there has not been an atom of attempt to prove one of the positions that lay on Mr. Roberts to prove.

THE CHAIRMAN: Allow me to say that I do think that those persons who are not prepared to calmly listen to both sides should not have come. I for my part am very desirous of hearing what each of the disputants has to say, and I am of opinion that if I listen quietly I shall be in a better position to judge at the end of the debate than I shall be if I am continually interrupted and they are interrupted too. Do please let us have quietness: restrain your feelings. I wish that neither gentleman shall have any reason to complain of the way in which he has been treated by the audience. Mr. Roberts will now occupy a quarter of an hour, and will have the option either of making a speech or putting questions to Mr. Bradlaugh, which Mr. Bradlaugh will answer categorically.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. BRADLAUGH.

Mr. BRADLAUGH, do you believe that ever such a man as Saul of Tarsus existed? — I have not evidence sufficient to believe that he did exist.

Are you doubtful? — it is quite possible a man named Saul of Tarsus may have existed.

If I were to prove that the book of Acts and Paul's epistles were in circulation at the close of the first century, would you doubt then that such a man as Paul existed and took a leading part in the establishment of the Christian faith? — I think you had better give me the proof first, and then I will tell you what my opinion is on that proof.

It will make it more worth my while to produce the proof if I have some hope of doing good. — If you produce the proof I must be convinced by it, and it is no use asking me what effect it will have on me till I see it.

I ask you whether you will accept Paul's epistles as proof of Paul's existence? — I accept proof as a fair man, when the proof is produced.

I asked you last night how far back you allowed the New Testament to have existed, and I think you said you could trace it no further back than A.D.150? — I stated that the four gospels cannot be brought to a date as early as A.D.150.

Would you object to substitute in your answer the New Testament for "the four gospels"? — Yes, I certainly should.

Why do you fix on the year 150 for any part of the New Testament? — Because I know I can show it later than that, and I always like to be on the safe side.

What is the earliest date you can show it? — That is not my business. It is your business to show it, and I decline to give you proof which it is your business to bring.

Can you trace it before 150? — I have already said that I decline to give you proof which it is your business to bring.

Why do you fix on that year? — Because I know you cannot produce the shadow of a particle of evidence, going earlier.

Can I produce any at that time? — I don't know what you can produce, because I don't know how far your researches have extended.

I am speaking to a gentleman on the supposition that he is educated, and I am asking him how far the proof can be carried in his view of the case? — You will find the whole of the proof stated by me in my pamphlet, *When were our Gospels written?* in my discussion with B. Harris Cooper, Esq., in *Horne's Introduction to the Bible*, in *Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament*, in *Norton's Introduction*, and in other works of that class.

Then you cannot tell why you fix on 150? — Yes, I have told you: so that you sha'n't catch me on a wrong date.

You have told me generally; I ask for specific information? — And I decline to give you that which it is your duty to produce.

You can't do it, then? — Yes, I can.

Then you won't? — No; it is your business to prove your case, not mine to make it out for you.

Then I must produce it. I first produce the book itself: every book is *prima facie* evidence of itself until it is disproved. — That is not true.

It is a canon of universal criticism that a document is evidence of itself until it is disproved? — No, that is not true: the book of Mormon is not evidence until it is disproved; the tale of the sea-serpent is not evidence until it is disproved.

Then you refuse to recognise the universal principle of literary criticism? — It never has been the principle of literary criticism in relation to theological Scriptures.

Well, all I can say, of course, is that you contradict the facts. — I generally do, especially when they are not true.

Can you disprove that Paul wrote the Epistles bearing his name? — It is not my business to try until you have given me the proof.

I give you the proof — I have not heard it.

“Ye see how large a letter I (Paul) have written unto you with mine own hand.” (Gal. 6:11). — What are you reading from?

I am reading from Paul’s epistles. — That is the book you have got to prove.

Then I produce the book as *prima facie* evidence. Can you disprove it? — Really, that is simple nonsense. If I produce a bill signed “Robert Roberts”, before I am entitled to make Robert Roberts pay, I must prove his signature.

Then I ask you, why don’t you believe the evidence I produce that Paul wrote that statement? — Because I don’t: the evidence is not sufficient to induce me to believe it. There have been so many forgeries in connection with apostolic writings that I am inclined to look at all of them as false until I have evidence of their verification.

What are apostolic writings? — Writings pretending to be by apostles.

Do you mean to say that those are apostolic writings that are not apostolic writings? — I do not mean to say anything more than my answer conveyed.

Do you mean to say a pretended thing is a thing itself? — Everything is a thing.

“A pretended thing”? — A pretended shilling is a shilling.

Is it a real one? — The difference between a pretence and a reality is that one is sham and the other is real.

I ask you if an apostolic writing is not a real apostolic writing? — A forged apostolic writing is no more a real apostolic writing than a forged bill signed “Robert Roberts” would be a real bill signed “Robert Roberts”.

I ask about a real apostolic writing? — I know nothing of any real ones.

Then what do you mean by apostolic writings? — I said “forged”.

“Forged!” Then I ask again, Are forged apostolic writings real? — If you don’t know the meaning of the words you have used yourself, I cannot supply you with any better.

Are forged apostolic writings real? — Forged apostolic writings are real forgeries, but are not real writings by apostles.

Then do I understand you to mean that there are no such things as real apostolic writings? — That is not my business. Show me something, and ask me whether I consider that to be so, and I will answer.

I ask you whether there are such things as real apostolic writings? — Out of the enormous mass of forgeries, I have not been able to find any.

What proof of forgery can you give me in Paul’s letters or outside of them? — If you will hand me the volume of Eusebius, I will give you lots of proofs of forgeries.

I ask you about the Epistle to the Corinthians. — I have not said it is a forgery.

Then do you admit it is real? — It is not my business to do so.

Can you prove it is a forgery? — I have not said it is a forgery.

Do you believe it real? — My belief is not an atom's weight in this debate. We are not discussing "Does Mr. Bradlaugh believe the Bible to be an authentic revelation?" We are discussing "Is the Bible an authentic revelation?" and Mr. Roberts undertook to prove it. I don't believe those to be the writings of Paul, but I don't necessarily involve any allegation as to forgery about them, because it is not part of my case.

I must return to my question. I must insist upon an answer whether or no Mr. Bradlaugh believes the 1st epistle to the Corinthians to be forged or real? — I don't believe the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians to be the writing of Paul.

Then if it is not the writing of Paul, is it not a forgery? — I don't know anything about it until you give me the evidence for it, and then I will tell you my opinion on that evidence.

What is your reason for saying it is not the writing of Paul? — Because the evidence that I have examined has not brought the opinion to my mind that it is Paul's.

Have you any evidence that it is not? — That is my business, not yours; your business is to prove that Paul wrote it.

Is it your business to take away the foundation on which I stand? — Oh! the moment you build a foundation I will knock it away quick enough.

I ask again, are you prepared to prove Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians a forgery? — I have not said it is a forgery. I have said I do not believe that to be the writing of Paul. It is not my business to express anything more than my belief at the moment.

If it be not the writing of Paul, is it not a forgery in pretending to be so? — I can give no other answer than that I don't believe the writing to be the writing of Paul, and that it is your business to make out that it is.

And my question is that if it be not the writing of Paul, is it not a forgery in pretending to be so? — If it does pretend to be the writing of Paul, and is not the writing of Paul, then it is a forgery; but my belief and the fact are two distinct matters.

Will you define the sense in which you used the term "forgery" as applicable to a literary document? — O yes; I say that where I can show that the name of an author has been used for a book that he never wrote, that if that has been used intentionally then that is a forgery; but it may have been used unintentionally: then it is not a forgery but a blunder.

Then do you mean to start the theory that somebody unintentionally wrote these letters as Paul's letters, when they were not the letters of Paul? — That is not my business.

I ask you whether that is the theory you wish to broach to-night. — I will tell you my theory in my speech.

Do you believe that Josephus, the Jewish historian, wrote, in the first century, the works which are attributed to him in our day? — I believe that the works accredited to Josephus in our day, are, with slight alterations, as Josephus left them to us.

Have you any better evidence in the case of Josephus than you have in the case of Paul? — I think yes.

Please produce it. — The business is not for me to prove the writings of Josephus, and, therefore, I decline.

Can you produce contemporary evidence of Josephus having written a work which you believe to be his? — I can produce it, only that it is no part of this debate, and therefore, I utterly decline to do it, because I have not relied on Josephus. I can produce quotations, in every age, coming through from time to time, of the writings of Josephus; but it is not my business to do it; it is no part of this debate, and I decline.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I can understand that this process of questioning and answering might be extremely interesting if we were only permitted to listen to it quietly. Mr. Bradlaugh will now have the privilege of either making a speech or questioning Mr. Roberts.

MR. BRADLAUGH QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

By whom do you think the Book of Genesis was written? — By Moses.

When? — Principally while the Israelites were sojourning in the wilderness for forty years.

But about what date is that? — About 1500 years before Christ, more or less.

Can you show me any evidence that the Book of Genesis was in current circulation about 1500 years before Christ? — Yes.

Will you please give it? — I produce the book itself.

Except producing the book itself can you give any evidence that the Book of Genesis was in current circulation 1500 years before Christ? — I can give the consent of subsequent generations in an unbroken line for many centuries.

Then as you can give it in an unbroken line for many centuries, give me one in the year 1400 before Christ? — Joshua.

Give me a writing of Joshua? — I produce it.

Show it to me? — You know it.

Do you mean the Book of Joshua in the authorised version? — Yes.

Give me any evidence that Joshua wrote it? — I produce the evidence (pointing to the book).

Give me any evidence that Joshua wrote it? — Then I will read it.

Please, just give me chapter and verse as you read? — The 8th chapter of Joshua.

Please tell me the verses. — I will read them.

No; if you will tell me them I will read them: I can read them quicker. — You must allow me to read them, Mr. Bradlaugh.

No; I must read them.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bradlaugh asks Mr. Roberts to produce the passage and read it; Mr. Roberts has a right to do so. That is the fair and proper way. If he occupies a long time, then the time is lost to one gentleman as much as another, when it is questioning that is going forward.

Mr. ROBERTS: “And he (Joshua) wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel.” “And afterwards”, verse 34, “he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, *according to all that is written in the book of the law, there is not a word of all that Moses commanded*, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel.”

Is that the whole of your evidence that the Book of Genesis was in existence in the time of somebody who you say wrote this Book of Joshua? — No.

Then give me the evidence, because there is not a word about Genesis here: it refers to a book about law — a copy of the law written upon stones, and it does not refer to a book written by Moses; and I want you to give me the evidence that Moses wrote a book which we now have called Genesis. This evidence is that Joshua wrote a book, and not that Moses did. — Do you deny that the law there spoken of is the law of Moses?

It is your business to prove what you said you would prove. — Then I prove it again. This is a verse I did not read before.

What verse? — The 33rd. “And all Israel, and their elders, and officers, and their judges, stood on this side the ark and on that side, before the priests the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, as well as the stranger as he that was born among them; half of them over against mount Gerizim, and half of them over against Mount Ebal; *as Moses, the servant of the Lord, had commanded before*, that they should bless the people of Israel. And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to *all that is*

written in the book of the law.” Now what is that? I will refer to Deuteronomy to prove that.

But wait a moment. Your statement was — and I recall it to you — that the Book of Genesis was written by Moses, and that you could bring evidence of that, and you said that you could bring evidence in the time of Joshua. I asked you for proof that the book was written in the time of Joshua. That you have not given me, but you read me instead a statement in the Book of Joshua — a statement that Joshua wrote a copy on the stones, and that he read it to the people. Now how is that evidence? — It is a recognition of the fact by Joshua that Moses had written a book of the law.

Where does it say so in those verses which you have just read? — It says that Joshua wrote — “According to all that is written in the book of the law”, and I was proceeding to prove what that was when you interrupted me.

No, but you must prove it from Joshua. You cannot prove it from any other than Joshua until you abandon Joshua: Can you find me in the Book of Joshua a statement, that Moses wrote the book which we now have as Genesis? — I have produced it, and I have not completed my evidence.

But is there any other portion of the Book of Joshua you want to read? — Not at present.

Then I decline to allow you to read any other than the evidence you offered. Will you now give me the evidence that Joshua wrote the book from which you have just been reading? — I begin at the modern end of the line of the evidence.

No, but you will please begin where I ask you. You said you would trace it from the time, and I want you to begin by showing that Joshua wrote it. — What I said was that I relied on the Books of Moses having been written by Moses by the consent of subsequent generations in an unbroken line.

Then I want you to begin at that time. — I trace the line backwards.

But I decline to allow you. I want you to begin at the beginning, and I ask you to give me the evidence because your statement was in your speech that you would give evidence that the writings were in current circulation at the time they were produced, and I want you to show that the writing you call *Joshua* was in current circulation at the time it was produced.—The book itself is evidence of its production.

Show me the date of it. — What do you mean?

I mean the date on the book. You say there is a date on the book, and I want to see it. — I did not say there was a date on the book: I said the book was evidence of the date of its production.

What was the date of production? — 1500 years before Christ.

Where do I get it? — By a calculation of the various dates involved in the narrative.

You spoke of the consent of subsequent generations. — Yes.

Give me the consent of someone at that time. — I produce Josephus, who —

But Josephus was — did not live at that time. — You must allow me to finish my answers.

Josephus is 1300 years at least later than the date I am enquiring about, and it is not fair when I ask for contemporary consent to give me Josephus, 1400 years later, and say that is evidence. — Mr. Bradlaugh you must allow me to answer your question, and you will see whether or not I give you the evidence you want: You break in upon me before I have done.

You said you could prove from Joshua that Moses wrote the book we call Genesis, and I want the evidence, not from Josephus, but from Joshua. — You want evidence from anywhere I can get it surely. —

No, I don't; I want it from the witness you call Joshua. — And I have produced it.

Then show me that the book you call *Joshua* was in existence 1300 years before Jesus. — And I produce the book itself as evidence.

Then show me that the book was in existence. — I am about to do it, and you will not allow me.

But Josephus was 1400 years later, and I object to that. I want a witness of the date you pretend the book came. — I am going to prove it just as you would prove to me the age of Homer's writings.

But the age of Homer's writings is not the matter in debate. What you have said is that you can show the Book of Genesis in existence in the time of Joshua. You try to do that by quoting a book you call the Book of Joshua, and I want you to show me the Book of Joshua in existence 1400 years before Jesus. — And I am about to do it, and you will not allow me.

Then try; but not from writings 1400 years later. — If I can prove it in any way proof is proof. I produce Christ as a good witness, because —

But Christ was 1400 years later. — Mr. Bradlaugh, you ought not to interrupt my answers. If you interrupt my answers I shall decline to answer any more questions.

I will interrupt the answers if they are not answers to the question. — Then I will not answer any question, because you cannot judge till you hear my answer whether it is an answer or no.

The CHAIRMAN (to Mr. Bradlaugh): You might have avoided this difficulty by making your question a little more definite.

I have made it very definite.

The CHAIRMAN: But there was just the possibility of mistake on Mr. Robert's part. If you say, produce me evidence from a book of that date.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: That is what I have asked for, I say, produce me evidence from the year 1400 before Christ, or about that time, that the book you call the Book of Joshua was in existence? — And I am producing the evidence, and Mr. Bradlaugh will not allow me to elaborate.

But which is the author you are going to quote? — You won't wait to see.

The chairman has made a very fair suggestion. Can you give your evidence without quoting writers 1400 years after; yes or no? — Yes.

Which is the nearest writer to the 1400th year before Christ that you can quote? — At the very time.

Very well; now we have got it. Then quote me some writer at the very time to show that Joshua wrote the book. — Joshua.

But how can you prove that Joshua wrote it? — By evidence which you have prevented me giving. You know there are no books extant in the world except the Bible that existed at that age.

Oh! then now your answer is, there are no books extant in the world except the Bible which existed at that age? — Yes.

Then were you wrong when you said that you would give evidence that the writings were in current circulation at the time they were produced? — No: I was not wrong.

But how can you give evidence if you have only got the book itself to rely on? — The book itself is *prima facie* evidence until it is disproved.

Do you mean to say, then, that every book in the world is *prima facie* evidence for the truth of its contents. — Until it is disproved.

Of course. But I say, do you mean that every book in the world is *prima facie* evidence of the truth of its contents? — It is *prima facie* proof of its authenticity, which is another point altogether. I admit the authenticity of the Koran, but I do not believe the contents.

But wait a moment. You have said two things; first, that you would show that the Book of Genesis was written by Moses, and that it was in circulation 1500 B.C. — Yes.

Asked for your proof, you simply quote a certain text from the Book of Joshua. — I do not simply do so; I was about to do that which you will not allow me to do.

Pardon me for a moment. Have you any other evidence outside the Bible of the circulation of the books at all: yes or no? — In a general way, yes.

Give it in a general way, then, outside the Bible. — I will only refer to it in a general way, because I presume you are acquainted with the facts, and that as an honest man you will —

Give it in a general way. — I prove it by the evidence of Ptolemy Philadelphus' library.

But is Ptolemy Philadelphus within a thousand years of Joshua? — No; but the presence of the Septuagint there is evidence that logically goes far back beyond the library itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Roberts will now speak for a quarter of an hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I only wish Mr. Bradlaugh would employ the opportunity he has during his option of questioning me for 15 minutes, to put to me that host of difficulties he says I did not answer, instead of wasting the time with uncertain and impracticable issues which do not really affect the question, though apparently to the point. As he has never yet so used his opportunity of bringing home to me the alleged discrepancies and difficulties in the Scriptures, he has no right to complain of my not noticing them in the time allotted to me to maintain the affirmative; for what is the duty of any speaker who undertakes to prove the affirmative of anything but to rehearse the positive evidences on which his proposition rests? Positive evidences are far more profitable to consider than mere gaps and negations. The positive argument is more powerful to sustain a proposition than an attempt to grapple with multitudinous details of an opposing character, which are capable, with deliberation and coolness, of being harmonised with the affirmative, but which, in the short time allowed to the disputants, and in the heat of discussion, are not capable of being treated in a satisfactory manner, if the main duty of marshalling the positive evidence is to be performed. I prefer to rehearse before you the great positive evidences on which rests the proposition that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation; and Mr. Bradlaugh's business is to destroy those positive evidences if he can. He has not yet attempted to touch those evidences, and, to-night, for the second time, he has said that it is not his business to do so. He tries rather to inveigle me into the consideration of details which would conceal the general argument from view. I must simply disregard his tactics, and address myself to the important duty of the moment, and that is to make some attempt, in our day, when scepticism is creeping into every corner like a rising tide, to show reasonable minds that there are evidences that cannot, in true, calm and unbiassed process of logic be got rid of, which go to show that God spoke by Moses and the prophets to Israel, and that Jesus rose from the dead and is now in heaven, and will re-appear among men, to carry out that great programme which God has put in his hands to accomplish for the regeneration of mankind and the blessing of all the families of the earth at the appointed time, when we shall have got through the present wretched but necessary preliminary period, when men like Mr. Bradlaugh can with impunity go about and try to blast

the hopes of men by attempting to destroy the only foundation of hope that is extant amongst men; for certainly if the Jewish Scriptures do not contain the elements of that hope, there is no hope, and we must be content to drift down the dreadful stream of time to the region of alluvial deposits, and to be laid among those fossils whose eternal fellowship is all that Mr. Bradlaugh can offer us as the result of a life's exertion and a life's sacrifice on behalf of the highest aims.

Pursuing that policy, then, I recall your attention to the great and unimpeachable facts connected with the apostle Paul. Not only did he personally testify for forty years, in the face of the organised and formidable opposition of Jew and Gentile, that he had seen Christ; not only did he base upon that testimony the most earnest practical and noble objects it is possible to aim at or conceive in connection with men; not only did he write to communities of the people those epistles of unexampled loftiness, density, purity and power; not only did he work miracles in the execution of his work, but there are minor practical elements in his case which, when impartially considered, will do as much as anything else, to convince sober, practical and unbiassed intellects of the truth of Paul's whole testimony for Christ. I may mention, as a singular illustration of the truth of this remark, that the late Lord Lyttelton, in his early days, stood on Mr. Bradlaugh's ground in being a sceptic, and in connection with another gentleman, he undertook to prove the fallacy of the Scriptures by an analysis of the case of Paul. With this view, he sat down to examine that case thoroughly in all its facts, with all the collateral circumstances involved in Paul's epistles, whose authenticity he confessed himself bound to admit, unless he chose to reject all established rules of evidence. In the execution of his task, he came to the very opposite conclusion to that which he intended to establish. He came to the conclusion that Paul's case was a proof of the resurrection of Christ; and he reduced to writing, in a systematic way, the whole of the considerations that had guided him to that conclusion, so that others might have the benefit. That argument is extant now, and accessible to anyone; and if examined by logical minds, open to follow the results of evidence, I am convinced it cannot fail to bring them to the same result.

A few, then, of the minor but potent elements in Paul's case are these. First, he was successful in his labours; he carried away whole districts; he turned the minds of vast masses of men, notwithstanding the opposition of the authorities and notwithstanding the fact that imprisonment and ruin stared in the face of every one who should adopt his views. This is a circumstance to which too much weight cannot be attached in the argument. The proof of the circumstance I give by reading an extract from the undisproved Acts of the Apostles, and which indeed are their own proof to any man who will calmly read them. In chapter 19 of the Acts of the Apostles, verse 23, we read: "At the same time there arose no small stir about that way": that is, in Ephesus, "for a certain man named Demetrius, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen; whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, sirs, ye know that

by this craft we have our wealth. Moreover ye see and hear, that *not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people*, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands: so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at naught, but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth. And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians. And the whole city was filled with confusion; and having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre. And when Paul would have entered in unto the people, the disciples suffered him not", for they were afraid for his personal safety in such a turmoil. That is evidence of the fact that his preaching produced a wide-spread effect in the teeth of persecution; and as reasonable men, you have to explain that circumstance. What is the explanation? If Christ rose from the dead, if Paul worked miracles, then the circumstance is explained; but if Christ did not rise from the dead, then Paul was a madman, and could not work miracles, and how in that case are you to explain the fact that those vast multitudes went in the teeth of their dearest temporal interests for the sake of believing Paul's doctrine? There is no explanation apart from that one explanation which I stand before you to represent. There are only four suppositions possible in the case, and they are all inconsistent with the facts except one. No man will say Paul was an impostor; no man will say he was an ignorant enthusiast; no man will say that he was an earnest man deceived by others, for the incident which Paul alleged as the great turning point of his career was of a character that did not admit of the interposition of others in the way of deception. It was something that happened in the broad daylight: it was not at night; it was at noon-day, and what he saw was a light above the brightness of the sun, which is not a thing that could be done by deception. The company of officials who were with him saw it also, and were felled to the earth by the brightness of the light. Besides the light, Paul heard a voice, and here I am reminded of Mr. Bradlaugh's difficulty about the narrative on this point, to which I will address myself for a moment, as an illustration of the unreal character of the difficulties raised by Mr. Bradlaugh, and which could all of them be dissolved if there were time to address myself to them in detail. In one account it is said that those that were with Paul did not hear the voice; in another, namely, Paul's own account, it is said they did. What is the explanation of that? Is it a contradiction? It appears like it; but what is the fact? There are two senses in which the word *voice* is used: you say you hear voices in the street, though you cannot make out the words; you hear a voice if you hear a person speak to you. In the one case you hear without being able to make out what is said: in the other you hear the words. A man who hears the voice and hears the words hears it in both senses; and that was the fact with Paul; but in the case of Paul's attendants they only heard the sound of the voice without making out the words. Probably this was because the voice "spake to him in the Hebrew tongue". The officers that

accompanied him would probably be Romans, and they while hearing the voice, would not know what was said, and therefore they could be said by one narrator to hear and by another not to hear without any contradiction occurring. Paul's attendants afterwards led him by the hand to Damascus, and when they arrived there, a certain man came to him named Ananias with a message from Christ. Mark this circumstance. On any other supposition than the reality of Christ's appearance to Paul, it is inexplicable. How came Ananias to know about Paul at all? The New Testament account is that Christ appeared also to Ananias: if this be true, the explanation is obvious, and Christ's resurrection proved; but if Christ did not appear to Ananias, how came he to know that Paul had been the subject of the incidents that happened on the way? The account is (Acts 9:10): "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias; and to him said the Lord in a vision, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and enquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth, and hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him that he might receive his sight. Then Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on Thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way, for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel; for I will show him *how great things he must suffer for my name's sake.*" That is another element in the case. Paul was to suffer by the new course to which he was introduced. If Paul had been to gain any advantage by it, it might have been suggested that he had some sinister object in his testimony; but he gained nothing; he realised the sufferings referred to here. Afterwards, when Paul was brought before King Agrippa, there occurred this remarkable interchange of remarks between the two. Festus, in introducing Paul's case, said (Acts 25:24), "King Agrippa, and all men that are present here with us, Ye see this man, about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jerusalem and also here, crying that he ought not to live any longer. But when I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himself hath appealed to Augustus, I have determined to send him, of whom I have no certain thing to write, unto my lord. Wherefore, I have brought him forth before you, and specially before thee, O King Agrippa, that after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes laid against him. Then Agrippa turns to the prisoner, and says, "Paul, thou art permitted to speak for thyself. Then Paul stretched forth his hand, and answered for himself". And observe his compliance with the decorous customs of society, his courtesies, not at all characteristic of a self-confident and egotistical and visionary enthusiast. "I think myself happy, King Agrippa, because I shall answer for myself this day before thee, touching all the things whereof I am accused of the Jews, especially

because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews: wherefore, I beseech thee to hear me patiently". It is just as good as having Paul on this platform to rehearse his own case in the presence of Mr. Bradlaugh. "My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among my own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews, which knew me from the beginning if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion, I lived a Pharisee. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"

Mr. BRADLAUGH: There is one thing that I think I ought to do before commencing this speech, and that is personal to myself. A little while ago I disputed the ruling of the chairman. It happened to be exactly the reverse of the ruling of the chairman last night, and I thought I was right in disputing it at the moment. I now think I was wrong. I think that when you accept a chairman you ought not to challenge his decision, and I therefore tender him my apology.

I feel considerably troubled about the course this debate has taken, because, frankly, I would not have entered into it at all if I had not thought that the best that could be said for the authenticity of the Scriptures would be said, and that I could reply to it. And I hold that it is not the proper way to prove that authenticity by simply reading from the Bible and contending that that is evidence, because with reference to the New Testament, I put the challenge in a very narrow shape, because I challenged there the possibility of evidence of the four Gospels until the year A.D.150. Now on that I am either right or wrong. The burden is on Mr. Roberts, and he ought to have been prepared, before he entered into a debate of this kind at all, to deal with that, and what he ought to have been prepared to do would have been this had he been frank: he would have said, the old Hebrew books, I am not prepared to verify them in the same fashion, because there is in the Hebrew nation only that literature to which I can appeal: there is no literature outside it. But he then would be bound to try the books on their contents. What I complain of is this that he pretends there is evidence, which he ought to know don't exist, and that he don't answer frankly, for the purpose of avoiding the confession of it. And I will give you what seems to me the most startling evidence of that. Challenged to prove that the book of Genesis existed at what he called the era of Joshua, he read these verses — and why I wanted to read them was: I knew that they had nothing whatever to do with it, and I knew that I would read them much quicker than he did, and that it would give me the opportunity of asking further questions. There is not a particle in the 31st, 32nd, 33rd, or 34th verse which he read identified any books as written by Moses then being in existence. On the contrary, the pretence is there that Joshua wrote something upon stones, not that Moses wrote something, and not that they had then got that which Moses wrote.

Well, now we come to the only difficulty which Mr. Roberts chose to deal with. He says he could deal with all of them; why don't he? He wants me to take up the

time of my speech in questioning. It is enough for me to state the objections in my speeches. I have plenty of other matters I want to deal with. I want to show that Mr. Roberts has not a ray of evidence in favour of the case he ought to maintain. But he says, Oh! the statements in the 9th of Acts and the 22nd of Acts are reconcilable, for although one says they heard a voice, and the other says they did not hear it, it does not mean that, but it means that they did hear it but did not understand it. Now I ask, If this is a divine revelation, why did not God say what He meant, instead of leaving it for Mr. Roberts 1,800 years afterwards to give the explanation? Well, Mr. Roberts says they all fell down; but Acts says No, they stood speechless. I don't know whether they did or did not; I only know that the story contradicts itself. Mr. Roberts says that Christ rose and was seen for a long period prior to his ascension. I quoted from the 24th of Luke to show you that that was impossible, and he never dared to answer it. Which statement is true? both cannot be. Let us dismiss such things as Lord Lyttelton. The Lord Lyttelton who has just died never said he was an Atheist at any time.

Mr. ROBERTS: His father: they are both "late".

Mr. BRADLAUGH: You should say what you mean. Now I have another allegation, and I am extremely doubtful whether the most straining of opinion can identify the views of Lord Lyttelton, as expressed in his writings — now dealing with Lord Lyttelton the father — at any time of his life, with the opinions put forward by me. But if it were so, the fact that Lord Lyttelton said one thing at one time of his life, and at some other time of his life said something else, makes nothing out whatever for the case Mr. Roberts has to prove. I will tell you what would be important: if he would put forward the evidence on which Lord Lyttelton was convinced; then that evidence might have some effect. But I have never yet found Mr. Roberts quote accurately from any things he has been dealing with, and I want precise evidence, not general statements, because the general statements, when examined, simply come into nothing at all. What is the case? O! Paul spoke. But suppose Paul did speak, how does this get rid of the objection I took to the 21st of Exodus, which gave a man the right to have a slave, to keep that slave, if he were a Jew, for seven years; if he at the end of that time had been married before he went into slavery, he was to take his wife and children with him; but if his master had given him a wife, and she had borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children were to be the master's. How can any statement about Paul make that a revelation from a good God? How can anything make the text in Deuteronomy, which says you are to kill a man who tries to entice you away from your religion — how can any statement about Paul make that a revelation from a good God? How can any statement about Paul make that a revelation from a good God which says both thy bondmen and bondmaids shall be of the heathen round about you, and they shall be your bondmen and bondmaids for ever? Nothing about Paul will make that into a good declaration. The civilisation of the world condemns it, the humanity and civilisation of to-day reject it; and then, Mr.

Roberts ventures to tell me about my scepticism, which is ruining the world — yes, my scepticism has had to fight against the slavery which this book taught — against the corruption which this religion fostered. But Mr. Robert's business in this debate is not to attack my scepticism, but to prove that these Scriptures are an authentic Divine revelation. I am quite willing to come at another time and defend my scepticism against any representative Christian. Here I bind myself to the Bible, and when he talks about my wanting to put you amongst fossils at any rate the fossils are better than the hell and damnation which this book teaches. But these kind of things are no arguments either on one side or another: they are simply so much talk thrown in to utterly avoid the subject. The subject we ought to deal with is this: Is there evidence of the authenticity — that is of the authorship — of these books? What is the evidence? It is not for Mr. Roberts to say to me, Can you disprove it. Because, supposing I am the most ignorant man in the world, that don't make out a case for him. My business is not to disprove. In the opening of a case on the part of the plaintiff in a court of law — because Mr. Roberts has talked about what ought to be done in a court of law — the plaintiff has to prove his case; the only duty of the defendant is to cross-examine the witnesses, and unless a *prima facie* case be made out, he is not obliged to do anything more, and that is what I say here: there is no case to go to a common sense jury. Mr. Roberts has read, in a tone of voice which may be effective from the pulpit, texts from the Bible, but he has not given a particle of evidence outside. Friends, I cannot understand that Mr. Roberts could allow one of these points, which he says he can explain, to pass unexplained for three nights, when he knows the effect they must have. I show God cruel, I show God repenting, I show God vascillating, I show God unjust to peoples and favouring kings against peoples, I show God, by the texts I have quoted, giving pardon to kings, no pardon to people, and punishing a people for the offence of their king; and if you tell me that is a revelation from an all-wise God, and a just and merciful God, then language has a different meaning in your mouth than what it has when spoken by most English people. And I object that no man, when pleading here, has any right to cast my scepticism against me; his business is to make out *his book*. Without scepticism we should still have been in the dark ages of the world, when your Bible-Church was triumphant. If it had not been for the scepticism of the Arabian and the Moor, who lit up philosophy again when your Christianity had crushed out its flame, there would have been no possibility for the reform of to-day. When your Church was in the plenitude of its might, you had a divinely-ordained tyranny, a proud and licentious clergy, and not a shadow of aspiration amongst the people. You twit me with my scepticism: what have your Churches done? Look where huge cathedrals cumbered the ground, while poor men's dwellings were miserable, and the poor had no right. God's revelation! Why didn't it rescue peoples long ago? Why didn't it give freedom to peoples long ago? Why didn't it help the people long ago? Why didn't it relieve the poor and sick long ago? Why is it that infidelity has had to battle against the tyrannies of the world when your Church has taken the side of the

strong against the weak. Friends, I have nearly arrived at the exhaustion again of my time, and I have only to regret that this third night, as every other, is utterly fruitless on the question we have to discuss, because, if Mr. Roberts begins at the beginning of one epistle and reads to the end of it, until he has addressed some evidence as to the authenticity of that epistle, it is so much waste of time. We don't seem to apprehend the commonest principles of evidence in a case of this kind; and I ask you, who were against me when I began to speak — I ask you, if you think my opinions so bad, at any rate you ought to give the frankest and the best care to try to change those opinions, so that they may not influence others for wrong. I have been obliged to find throughout the whole history of the world that what you call *the Bible* has been on the side of the wrong, on the side of the mighty against the people, on the side of the priest against the poor, on the side of the rich abbot and richly-endowed cathedral and the rich King. I find the people in misery, and that those who have striven to rescue them have been assailed as sceptics during their lives, and have only been canonised when their bones have mouldered in the grave.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the threat that I addressed to you at the beginning we are about to remit: instead of keeping you later we intend this evening to close at ten o'clock, I shall therefore be obliged to restrict each gentlemen to ten minutes in their concluding speeches. Mr. Roberts will now speak.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the apostle Peter speaks of men who speak evil of things which they understand not. I am rather under the impression that we have had an exemplification of that in the speech to which you have just listened. Mr. Bradlaugh has said that fossils are better than hell-fire; so say I. But there is an implication under that remark which is not sustained by the facts. The implication is that the Bible teaches the eternal torment with which the clergy have striven to maintain their ascendancy in all those dark ages which Mr. Bradlaugh denounces, and which I denounce equally with him.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Bible is innocent of any such monstrous doctrine, as I am prepared to prove on the right occasion. He makes the Bible responsible for the cathedrals; I should like him to try to prove that the Bible has ordered cathedrals to be built by Christians. He makes the Bible responsible for the wretched houses of the poor and a great many other dark features which characterise the present, and more particularly the past, civilization of Europe. For these the Bible is totally irresponsible. The system of the Papacy, it is, which has given the political law to Europe during all the ages which Mr. Bradlaugh has referred to, and which in

itself is a great fulfilment of prophecy and a proof of the Bible's truthfulness, as I shall show when we come to that department of the subject — I say that these things which Mr. Bradlaugh denounces, are the doings of a system that has tried to suppress the Bible in the doing of them, in order that its iniquity might not be known.

But Mr. Bradlaugh says that the Bible is responsible for a few things that I am afraid to explain. By no means; I am not afraid to explain any of them. The things done and laws enjoined, through Moses, are legitimate enough in view of the prerogative of the lawgiver. Has God, who created man, no right to say when man shall be destroyed? Has Queen Victoria no right to order a man to be hanged? (No, no). Very well, have you any right as soldiers to shoot Frenchmen if they invade England? (A voice: yes). Then upon what principle will you deny that God has the authority to kill as well as to make alive? I own to and take the full responsibility of those statutes which are contained in the Bible: they are wise in their place and their time, and God is a better judge of time and place than we.

Then Mr. Bradlaugh has tried to make a great point of slavery. On this I have simply to say the slavery of the Bible is not the slavery against which modern anti-slavery advocates have had to contend: the slavery of the Bible was a mere domestic servitude in which rights were recognised as attaching to those in servitude. American slavery recognised no rights; but whatever the form of servitude might have been, I deny that any argument against the Bible could be extracted from it. Has God no right to dictate the form that domestic institutions may take? Is He not possessed of the highest wisdom to judge in what particular circumstances particular institutions are adapted to work best for objects He may have in view in dealing with men? If it came to detail, I would grapple with all these points: and I wish Mr. Bradlaugh would put them to me at the time he has to put questions to me: I would undertake to shoulder them all and not to stagger in the least degree in carrying the burden. They would not in the least shake faith in the Bible; for that faith is founded on too strong reasons to be touched by the kind of objection Mr. Bradlaugh relies on, and as to my treatment of those objections, notwithstanding the tirade of Mr. Bradlaugh against my method of argument, a logical mind is able to perceive that if my argument can be sustained, my proposition is established, that the Bible is the authentic and reliable record of divine revelation. For if Christ rose from the dead, surely it will not be denied that he was the Son of God; if he be the Son of God, surely it will not be denied that his approbation of anything is a proof that it is right, and that therefore his sanction of the writings of Moses and the prophets is a proof that they are authentic and reliable, even if there were a total absence of all other kind of evidence whatever. Is not that so? And I use the case of Paul to show that Christ rose from the dead in the same way that I used the case of the early Christians last night to show that he rose from the dead. And that line of argument Mr. Bradlaugh dares not attempt to meddle with. Instead of dealing with it, he piles upon me a number of little

points of alleged inconsistency in the book as a whole, and in a way that I am sure cannot carry conviction to cool and dispassionate and disinterested and logical minds, although it may please and tickle the fancies of a shallow class that do not understand the bearings of evidence. I shall not be diverted from my excellent plan. On the contrary, I rather invite Mr. Bradlaugh to follow me in that plan and pull down, if he can, the house I am building. His course is an oblique one. He did not attempt to allege that the Epistles of Paul are forgeries, and he will not admit them to be true. Why won't he admit what he cannot deny? Because if these epistles were written by Paul in the first century, my argument is substantiated, and the resurrection of Christ proved. He contents himself, therefore, with saying he has no proof that Paul wrote them. Why doesn't he give us the argument that leads him to doubt that Paul wrote these epistles? He talks of the practices of a court of law: who ever heard of a counsel for the defendant who shrank from exposing the forged character of a document produced and relied upon by the other side? Therefore on the very principle of advocacy Mr. Bradlaugh has himself sketched out, he ought to do that which he has refused to do; and he cannot do it: (energetically) I defy him to do it. (Laughter). You may laugh, but it is a very serious matter — so serious that you must excuse me for being in earnest. I am so certain that Paul was a true man, that Christ rose from the dead, that I am prepared to place my neck on the block to-night, if necessary, for my faith. You may make light of it, but Christ will shortly be in the world again, to the utter consternation of those who are so easily carried away by the shallow criticisms to which we have listened to-night — I had further arguments on the case of Paul, but as the chairman informs me I have only two more minutes, and as it would be impossible in that short time to develop those further arguments, I will resign my post to Mr. Bradlaugh.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts said why don't I touch the question that Christ rose from the dead. I thought I had challenged that what he had said about Christ being seen for forty days according to Acts was contradicted in Luke. I thought I had said, giving texts to him on the previous nights, and reminding him of it to-night, that the statement about Christ being three days and three nights in the grave was not true. I thought I had shown him on each of the two nights that the statements about the women who came to the tomb were self contradictory, one making it one woman, another making it two, and another making it more; and while I have mentioned these contradictions relating to the resurrection, it is simply an impertinence to say that I have not dealt with it.

Now we have a new case made. First, the Bible don't teach hell-fire; and for the purposes of this debate Mr. Roberts is governed by the authorised English version, which he agreed to accept. Mark, 9th chapter, verses 43 to 48: "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm

dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” And that is repeated over and over again. Matthew 25:41: “Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels”. Matthew 18:8: “Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.” Well, if “everlasting fire” don’t mean everlasting fire, if fire that can’t be quenched don’t mean fire that can’t be quenched, then we have got to get a new language. It cannot be said that this is wrongly translated from some other tongue, because Mr. Roberts has agreed to accept the authorised English version as authority in this debate. Then he says that the slavery of the Bible was a mere servitude, in which rights were recognised, but that the American slave laws did not recognise rights. I say that is not true. I have read with attention the decisions relating to the slave laws of America, and I say there was no portion of the slave laws of America which said that a man might beat his slave within three days of his life, and that if he lived till the third day he was not to be punished because he was his money; and I say that in Exodus 21:20, 21, it is provided that “if a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money”. I say that I am not here to defend American slavery. I admitted that American slavery reduced man to the position of a chattel, I admitted that it was damnable and wicked, and I admitted that the clergy defended it on the authority of this very book. I affirm that it was under cover of this book that pious slave-holders upheld their iniquitous system. Our friend says God in His highest wisdom knew what was best. I say that it was never best for any men at any time in the world to have the right to buy people whom they might beat within three days of their lives; I say it was never right for a rich murderer to escape because he paid for the man he had murdered. I say that it never could have been right to steal a woman and then turn her adrift. I say the whole thing is as monstrous as it can be. Then I am told, I am defied to prove the epistles of Paul to be a forgery. That is not the language that a man who is bound to prove them to be true should use to his opponent. Mr. Roberts has told me about the proceedings of law courts. If I don’t understand the Bible I understand the proceedings of law courts, and no man who knows me will say I don’t — and I say it is a most ridiculous proposition to say that if the plaintiff had not proved any case at all, that the defendant would try to contradict the case he had proved. If a deed is put in as evidence, it is not received as evidence until that deed is verified: it is only a piece of paper to which no attention is paid until it is proved by whom it was written. It is simply a piece of paper that the clerk of the court won’t read, because there is nothing in evidence about it.

Then I am told that I have led you off with silly criticisms. The wisdom of the criticisms must be judged by others by and bye. I have only followed Mr. Roberts in the course he has taken. I did not attack the general teachings of Christianity to-night until he had referred to the scepticism of myself to-night, and then it was a

fair retort to the speech he had made. If he wants to confine us to a critical examination of the book, I will follow him step by step; but if he fancies that flowers of speech will do, then to the best of my ability I will try flowers of speech too. I don't pretend that we have the deep and profound mind of our friend, who pretends to see evidence where it does not exist; but we have sufficient intelligence for the ordinary affairs of life, and we want that kind of evidence put to us here. Then we are told that there is a comparison between you killing Frenchmen who invade your country, and God telling the Jews to kill Canaanites who were born in the country the Jews invaded under the direction of your merciless Deity. Mr. Roberts says you will be justified in killing Frenchmen who invade your country.

Mr. ROBERTS: No, I did not.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: You did.

Mr. ROBERTS: No; I asked them if they believed they would be.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: But you must have meant something. If it was not intended to explain the one point by an analogy to the other, then it was a mere trick of speech, which might be proper in an infidel not governed by the considerations of the Bible, as Mr. Roberts is, but which ought never to have come from his side at all. Friends, we have nearly finished. I ask, is there one of you who has had the slightest evidence given to you that Christ rose? Has there been an attempt to prove any one of the facts, any kind of evidence given of the authenticity of any one of the books? No; all we have had is a daring "I defy Mr. Bradlaugh to disprove it!" My business is not to advance a line of negative proof: my business is to examine the evidence submitted from the other side; and you have not to do with my mere opinion. My mere opinion may be correct, or it may be incorrect. I pretend to no infallibility. I am ready to examine the evidence if it be submitted to me; but unless, during the three nights of the debate to come, Mr. Roberts is prepared to advance something, he had better make an announcement that he is not prepared to do it now, but will on some other occasion. This is the proper time and place to prove that it is God's Word, and it cannot be God's Word if it be full of cruelty, crime, treachery, deceit, and murder; full of those abominations which a civilised world has set aside. I beg to propose a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: That had better be reserved till the last meeting.

Fourth Night,
TUESDAY, 20th JUNE, 1876,
IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM.

MR. GEORGE H. ST. CLAIR IN THE CHAIR.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, The order of the discussion, this evening, will be the same as last Thursday. The order of the meeting will, I trust, be kept at least as well. There was not much to complain of on that occasion; but there was a little. Some few friends found they were not able to control their feelings; and it is reasonable to suppose that having made that discovery, they have stayed at home to-night. One or two friends, again, seemed desirous of taking part in the debate, and these, no doubt, have sent a challenge in the meantime, to Mr. Bradlaugh or Mr. Roberts, and they will reserve any further arguments until their own proper debate comes off. It cannot be too well understood that any interruption is a loss of time to the speakers, and a loss of time to the entire meeting, and cannot possibly result in any good. The subject for discussion is the same as before, namely, "Are the Scriptures the Authentic and Reliable Records of Divine Revelation?" Mr. Roberts will affirm that they are, and Mr. Bradlaugh will deny. I ask Mr. Roberts to resume the discussion.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Bradlaugh correctly defined the duties devolving upon the respective parties to this discussion when he said that it belonged to me to affirm that the Bible is true, and that it belonged to him to examine my evidence. Unfortunately, however, so far as the discussion has gone, Mr. Bradlaugh has not acted in accordance with that excellent definition. He has neglected entirely to examine the evidences, such as they are, which I have, so far, rehearsed in your hearing. He has not attempted to controvert the fact that there are Jews, though I should not have been very much surprised had he tried to do so. He has not attempted to controvert the fact that the existence of the Jews is required by the hypothesis of the truthfulness of the Bible. He has not controverted the fact that there is an ecclesiastical tyranny in Europe as the most prominent feature of the European system — a feature which has prevailed for many centuries, as the Bible required. He has not attempted to show that the existence of that ecclesiastical imposture is inconsistent with the position I am taking, or that it fails to sustain the argument I have founded upon it. With regard to the third proposition, he has not attempted to give us a reasonable account of

the origin of Christianity, nor has he attempted to deal with the account I gave, which I endeavoured to show was thoroughly reasonable. He has not attempted to deal with the case of Paul; but he has taken the extraordinary course of denying that there ever was such a man, or, at all events, that there is evidence sufficient to justify us in believing in his existence.

When, however, he did attempt to deal with any part of the positive evidence I have rehearsed in your hearing, he has done that which he said he was not called upon to do; he has attempted to disprove my evidence. This he has done by a hurried, rather excited and somewhat disconnected recital of miscellaneous points and passages, which he rather hinted at as inconsistent with my argument, than tried to show that they actually were so.

There was one notable exception to that course of his. I produced the writings of Paul as one of my principal and most valuable evidences. They exist, which is a great fact. I mean the existence of the epistles bearing his name is a great fact, for a reading of them would convince any unbiassed mind that they are no forgery; an unbiassed reader instinctively feels that a forger or literary inventor could not produce such writings. I produced them as a weighty element in the argument. Mr. Bradlaugh did not attempt to disprove them; he said it was not his business. He knows he cannot. When he cannot, he says it is not his business; but when he thinks he can, he tries.

But I am not content to leave the matter in that position. I was a little taken by surprise, I must confess, by Mr. Bradlaugh's tactics on this point, because it is universally conceded now, with the exception of a few of the more unscrupulous and uncritical of the unbelieving class, that Paul lived in the first century, and that Paul wrote these letters. I assumed that Mr. Bradlaugh would admit this also, and argue the case on the basis of that admission. Therefore I had not come prepared with the complete and exhaustive technical evidence which it is possible to produce in support of the fact. I would have prepared myself with the evidence if I had expected Mr. Bradlaugh would have taken the position he has taken. I have come to-night so prepared, and I shall carry the chain of evidence not only back to A.D.150, but right straight away into the days of Paul himself in an unbroken chain — not a broken one, such as Mr. Bradlaugh says he is contented with in the case of Eusebius. In the case of Homer, Herodotus, Livy, and other ancient writers, he has to be content with a very faint and broken chain of evidence, and the principle which guides him in accepting that evidence would compel him in consistency to accept Paul even if there were only a few scattered links, instead of there being, as there is, a chain without a single link missing.

I asked him last Thursday night how far back he would allow the New Testament to have existed. he said A.D. 150. I asked him his reasons for fixing upon that date, and he declined to give me them upon the somewhat trivial plea of being afraid to furnish me with valuable information. I hope Mr. Bradlaugh will not any longer refuse to answer my question on such a ground, or he will lay

himself open to the imputation that he is afraid to submit his case to the test of cross-examination. The object of all my questions is to put the position he takes to a logical test, and if he evades them, it is simply evading legitimate test, which will reflect injuriously on his advocacy. My object in asking for his reasons for admitting the existence of the New Testament as early as A.D.150, was that I might show to him had he given those reasons, that the evidence which carried the proof back to A.D. 150 would logically carry it back to the days of the apostles. This I hope now to make manifest.

There are five witnesses to the particular date Mr. Bradlaugh speaks of, not that they fix on A.D.150 as hard and fast line, but their witness establishes that date beyond all question. The five witnesses which I produce are Tatianus, who was born A.D.130, who wrote an oration to the Greeks and "The Harmony of the Four Gospels". Then there is Theophilus, of Antioch, who died A.D.181; he wrote three books to Autolycus, in which he mentions John, and makes thirty or forty quotations from the New Testament. We then have Athenagoras, an Athenian philosopher, who became a Christian, and flourished in the second half of the second century. He wrote a treatise on the Resurrection; and also addressed a petition on behalf of the Christians to the Roman Emperor of the day, asking that they might be shielded from the persecution to which they were subjected. In these two publications he quotes the New Testament twenty times. There is, then, Irenaeus, who was born A.D.130, died A.D.202. He wrote "five books against heresies". and in the course of his arguments, he mentions by name twenty one books of the New Testament. Earlier still, we have Melito, of Sardis, who wrote a work "Extracts from the Law and the Prophets", and in which he recognises the New Testament by speaking of the Old, a distinction which did not exist until there came to be a new one, of course. Then there is Papias, of Hierapolis, who died A.D.153, a disciple of Polycarp, who wrote five books of Commentaries, in which he distinctly mentions by name Matthew, Mark, Peter and John. All these men flourished in the middle of the second century, and gave evidence of the existence of the New Testament, certainly in A.D.150, for they quote from it as a book commonly accepted at that time. They were separate men, living in various parts of the world, all quoting the New Testament in A.D.150, which excludes the notion that the New Testament only came into existence in A.D.150; for, mind you, the argument is stronger than it appears. Athenagoras, for instance, tells the emperor, in his petition, that there was, at that time, a community acting upon the precepts of the New Testament, which he quotes. The very fact of his addressing a petition to the emperor is evidence of this; for precepts of the New Testament, which he quotes. The very fact of his addressing a petition to the emperor is evidence of this; for how came such a petition to be presented, except that there had, for a long time, existed a community of Christians subject to persecution. Athenagoras, to show their inoffensive character, quotes the precepts of Christ from Matt. 5, as those by which they were governed. Consider what this proves. It proves that the New Testament must have existed a long time previous to the time of Athenagoras writing; for how, otherwise, could subjection to New Testament precepts (so contrary to the natural impulses of men), have been extensively brought about?

I say, then, that the evidence that carries the New Testament back to A.D.150, logically carries it much farther back than that. But I am not content to rest my case there, and I march, step by step, back into the very age of the apostles while they were yet alive. I produce Justin Martyr. He was born A.D. 103; he was brought up a Greek philosopher, a man of education and of considerable natural abilities. I emphasise upon this, because this man was converted to Christianity in the year A.D.130, ten years after which, he wrote an apology to the then reigning Emperor (Antoninus Pius) on behalf of the Christians; and again in A.D.162, to Marcus Aurelius. In both of these, he quotes extensively from the New Testament. If the New Testament was only in existence in A.D.150, how came Justin Martyr to quote from it in A.D.140? and if Justin Martyr quoted from it in A.D.140, is that not evidence of its existence many years before? for how could you imagine an educated man, as Justin Martyr was, embracing Christianity A.D.130, and quoting in A.D.140, from books which were not current in the Christian community, at least at the time he joined them? And if they were current at the time he joined them, they must have been current many years before, for the Christians were scattered in many places, and Justin Martyr travelled among them, and had the opportunity of knowing the facts on so simple a point as this, that is, whether they had the New Testament in their possession or not; and whether, being in their possession, it was a genuine book or the production of forgers. A curious kind of forgery certainly, as anyone may see if they will read; it is a forgery impossible on the face of it. And a successful forgery, extraordinary certainly, if it were a forgery, for it is made up of letters purporting to have been addressed to communities in detail, which communities were in existence, and knew whether they had received those letters or not. But Mr. Bradlaugh says "Oh no; I don't say they are forgeries." When I ask him if they are genuine, then he says, "I have no evidence of it." This is incomprehensible. He broaches a new and extraordinary definition of forgery. I always understood that a forgery was an attempt to imitate something real and valuable; but in this case, Mr. Bradlaugh denies the value or the reality of the thing said to be forged. He will not admit the existence of real apostolic writings, though he says there is plenty of forged apostolic writings. This is an extraordinary position for anyone to take, and I must leave you to draw your own conclusions as to its meaning in this case. I have already spoken of Tatianus, who died A.D.153. He wrote five books of commentaries, in which he distinctly mentions Matthew, Mark, Peter and John. I may say I come prepared with the names of the books and with the quotations from them, if required, wherein all these things appear. Next, I take Polycarp, who was born A.D.80, when the apostle John was still alive. he died A.D.167. While he lived, he wrote a letter to the Philippians. I have that letter in my possession, and with me on the platform. In that letter, Polycarp mentions three books of the New Testament expressly by name, and quotes from the New Testament fifty times. Polycarp, in the early part of his life, had the society of the apostle John, and learned from him concerning Jesus. This we learn from

Irenaeus, the disciple and companion of Polycarp. Earlier than Polycarp, we have Ignatius, who was born A.D.35, a year after the crucifixion. He wrote seven epistles, in which seven epistles he quoted forty or fifty times from the New Testament, and refers once expressly to the Epistle to the Ephesians. He died A.D.107. If the New Testament were forged in A.D.150, how came it that Ignatius, who died A.D.107, quoted from it at the end of the first century? His epistles were written at the close of the first century, and in them he quotes the New Testament, which constitutes evidence not only that the New Testament existed at the time he quoted it, but that it was then recognised as a book which was a standard authority for reference among Christians. This shows a previous existence of many years. I go a step or two farther, and I take Hermas, who also flourished before A.D.100, while John the apostle was still alive. In his work, entitled *The Shepherd*, there are at least fifty quotations from the New Testament, and we know that Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, Origen and others, cite or refer to this work of Hermas as a writing antecedent to their days. Besides Hermas, we may take Clement, who is referred to by Paul. Clement was born A.D.30, and died A.D.100. He wrote a letter to the Corinthian Church, as I stated on a former evening, in which letter he expressly refers to Paul's epistle to the same community, and quotes many times from the New Testament. Then there is the testimony of Barnabas, who wrote a letter somewhere about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, to which he refers as a contemporary event; and in this letter is quoted the New Testament more than thirty times.

With regard to these witnesses, although I do not accept them as competent expositors of true Christian doctrine, yet they are competent witnesses of what existed while they were yet alive. A man may be a trustworthy witness of a fact without being accepted as a judge of the fact. For instance, scientific men may take the statement of an agricultural labourer as to the finding of a particular plant in a field, while we may reject his theory as to the nature and quality of the plant; or a country villager's evidence may be accepted to the existence of a certain custom in the village back to a certain date, without people being bound by his explanation of the meaning of that custom. We may accept the fact while we disregard the theory. So, these "Fathers", as they are called, may be taken as witnesses of what passed in their own day, as the writings of the apostles, though they may not be accepted as good judges with regard to the true nature of the doctrine of the apostles.

The evidence of the authenticity of the New Testament is so complete, that I can only account for Mr. Bradlaugh's objection to Paul's writings on one principle. There would be no difficulty about the authenticity if it were not for the apostolicity. If these writings of Paul merely ranked with those of the scholars of the day, Mr. Bradlaugh would accept the evidence of their authenticity. In fact he is bound to. There is no denial of the fact that these men whom I have quoted lived at that time. There is no denial of the fact that they wrote at that time, and

that they quoted the New Testament. It would not alter the argument if it could be shown that these were not their writings, because the writings produced, even if forged, were forged in the age during which Polycarp and the others lived (as shown by the recognition of their existence by Eusebius, Irenaeus, and others), and the quotations they contain from the New Testament would have the same force as showing that the New Testament existed, as if they were the production of their professed authors.

The evidence is complete. I have carried the proof right back to the age of the apostles. I have proved the New Testament to have been in existence in the first century. It is a perfect marvel that we have such an unbroken chain of evidence, for we have to remember that the Christians in their beginning were a sect everywhere spoken against, despised and trodden down, and composed principally of the poor. The wonder is that documents should have been produced among them which should be extant to the present day. It was different in the days of Eusebius. Then the protection of the State was thrown over them, and Christian documents became public documents, and Christian writers public writers under imperial patronage, as Eusebius was. Before then Christian documents were private documents, and the wonder is that they are now in existence at all. Having been proved from the beginning of their existence, I ask you to take up and apply the argument concerning Paul which I advanced the last night we were together. That argument properly belongs to to-night, and is in the same line as that previously pursued, though the evidence is stronger. With the proof of the document there is the proof of the facts, and therefore of the conclusion I sought to deduce from them.

I have referred to the internal evidence which Mr. Bradlaugh has refused to look at. Surely internal evidence should go for something. In my judgment it weighs a great deal more than any amount of external evidence that can be produced. I think I shall be able, though necessarily in a brief manner, to indicate some general considerations on this point which will help to carry conviction as to the divinity of this book. This belongs to the second part of my general propositions — that the Scriptures besides being “authentic” are “reliable”. He has confined himself to the word “authentic”. He has limited me in the argument to the idea of authenticity. This is a mistake, for a thing may be utterly worthless and still an authentic record. I believe the Koran to be authentic, but I don’t believe it to be reliable. I believe Mahomet wrote it, but I don’t believe what he wrote in it. Even on the question of authenticity the Koran cannot be placed in competition with the Bible; but it is necessary, besides saying it is authentic, to show that the Bible is a reliable account of the Divine dealings with mankind; and I proceed by a few hasty thoughts to make that apparent.

I call attention to this fact that the Bible, as a whole, is in harmony with what is now found scientifically to be true, though written at a time when the whole world outside of it was wrapped in speculative fog. I refer now to two items in particular

— God and man. With regard to God, the nations of the world said there must be a variety of gods, because there was a variety of power-manifestations. They saw fire and heat, and sunshine and darkness, and water and love and thunder, &c., and they argued these must be manifestations of separate deities. They, therefore, invented Jove and Venus, and Mars and Neptune, &c. A plurality of deities was believed in by almost every nation. But science has shown that all manifestations of power are referable to one common source, origin or principle, though that common origin is itself admitted to be inscrutable. The doctrine is defined as “the co-relation of forces”: that is, that all forces have their root or origin in one principle. Now, that fact the Bible taught ages before it occurred to natural thinkers. It taught that there is but one God and one universal Spirit, out of which all things have come. Did time allow, I would show this by a number of citations; but my time is drawing to a close. But there is a difference between the Bible form and the scientific form of this doctrine. Science, at least in the hands of some scientists, makes a curious application of its “co-relation” discovery, which I venture to say does not bear a favourable comparison with the Bible use of that truth. I now refer to the doctrine of the origin of the universe, as expounded by men who wish to get rid of a God, upholder of all, proprietor of all, to whom we are all responsible. They say the primal force is an unintelligent impersonal force. They won’t accept a personal God. They say they cannot comprehend such an explanation. They cannot comprehend how universal power should have a personal nucleus at one central point in the heavens, as taught by the Scriptures. They cannot grasp the idea of universal power being, in its totality, One Mighty Being. They reject it because they cannot understand it. But do they give us something they do understand? Let us see. They are obliged to admit that things have had a beginning, at least upon earth. They tell us of a time when the earth was in an incandescent state, and when there was no life on it. They tell us of a time before that, when there wasn’t even an incandescent world, but when its substance existed in a nebulous ethereal form, diffused throughout the universe. We follow them, and ask them what preceded the nebulous condition of substance? and whatever it was, how came it to advance to a more concrete state? If the impelling motion was due to blind, unreasoning, un sentient generation in the inert universe of vapour or gas, or whatever it was, why didn’t the generation take place countless ages before, when the same force being there, the same power of development existed? Why the blind force did not develop itself millions of years before it did is not explained. It ought to have brought itself out from eternity if there was no intelligence to plan, control, check, restrain, or stimulate. What a strange account of creation we have at the hands of such a theory. Here is the 1st chapter of Genesis, written by an American, according to the philosophy which Mr. Bradlaugh represents:—

CREATION ACCORDING TO DARWIN.

- 1.—Primarily the Unknowable moved upon cosmos and evolved protoplasm.
- 2.—And protoplasm was inorganic and undifferentiated, containing all things in potential energy; and a spirit of evolution moved upon the fluid mass.
- 3.—And the Unknowable said Let atoms attract, and their contact begat light, heat and electricity.
- 4.—And the unconditioned differentiated atoms, each after its kind, and their combinations begat rock, air and water.
- 5.—And there went out a Spirit of evolution from the unconditioned, and working in protoplasm, by accretion and absorption, produced the organic cell.
- 6.—And cell, by nutrition, evolved primordial germ, and germ developed protogene, and protogene begat eozoon, and eozoon begat monad, and monad began animalculae.
- 7.—And animalculae begate ephemera: then began creeping things to multiply on the face of the earth.

And so on, and so on. Is that a bit more intelligible than this?—

THE BIBLE ACCOUNT.

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.”

If that is mysterious, I can only say it is at least not more mysterious than the Darwin mystery, and if I must choose between mysteries, I would rather have mystery with intelligence in it than mystery without intelligence. I can understand how things made a start, if there was a designing initiative to start them. I cannot understand how things could start if there was nothing to give them an organic propulsion.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: On this, the fourth night of the debate, the names of the witnesses are mentioned, and Mr. Roberts says he can quote from them, but he has carefully refrained from doing it, and I will give you the reasons in my speech why he has not done so. He says I admitted that the New Testament existed A.D.150. But I am in the recollection of the audience, and still more in the recollection of the short-hand writer, whose notes will speak for themselves, and I am positive my answer was that not the slightest evidence could be shown of the existence of the Four Gospels before A.D.150. I did not say that at A.D.150 you could show the existence of the book, and if Mr. Roberts thinks I said so he has greatly misapprehended what I said. On the contrary, I took that date to be on the safe side, because I knew it was a long way on the safe side, and I cannot make out a man who has listened with reasonable attention having so entirely misunderstood the statement. Mr. Roberts has referred to Tatian, but not a word has he

quoted from Tatian, because there is not a word in existence, and that is a good reason for not quoting him. And here I must ask Mr. Roberts not to use people's names as witnesses, but to quote, with chapter and verse, the phrases on which he relies as evidence. It is simple impertinence to read names to us and tell us he has got the books here when those books do not exist in the world. Mr. Roberts next quotes Theophilus. The reference to Theophilus stands in much the same position as that to Tatian, with this exception, that there is a commentary of Theophilus which is referred to as spurious. If that is evidence all I can say is that language gets very puzzling. It is alleged by Lardner that the date given to Theophilus is A.D.181, and how that can come before A.D.150 my arithmetic don't tell me. Next we come to Athenagorus. With reference to this writer he never mentions either Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, by name, and when any texts are quoted from him, I will undertake to quote from him that which is not in the Four Gospels at all, and which he must have derived from some other gospels, which it will be my duty to mention to you before this evening is over. We now come to Ignatius — I beg pardon, Irenaeus; and the very funny way in which Mr. Roberts manages his dates is remarkable. He says "Irenaeus, born A.D.130, died A.D.202", and therefore he brings him before A.D.150.

Mr. ROBERTS: No.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I say yes, or I don't understand the meaning of the language Mr. Roberts uses. The books against heresies attributed to Irenaeus came between A.D.180 and A.D.190, and cannot possibly affect the question of what took place before A.D.150. Next we are told there is Mileto. Would Mr. Roberts name the particular works he relies upon. I don't mean the works of Christian evidence mongers 300 years after, but I mean the works which Mileto has handed down. I defy him to do it for the simplest of all reasons. He can only quote to you by the process of using the works of writers considerably later. Then Mr. Roberts uses the name of Justin Martyr. I have taken the pains of looking up Justin Martyr, who I thought would be referred to, because I wanted to have something to say in my speech without referring to the very agreeable nonsense with which Mr. Roberts concluded. Justin Martyr is supposed to have lived from A.D.130 to 140. Some put the date a trifle earlier and others a great deal later. Mr. Roberts says he was born A.D.103, converted A.D.130. Will you permit me to tell you that the whole of the dates which Mr. Roberts gives so glibly are disputed dates — not disputed by infidels, but by religious men. There are disagreements on every one of those dates, and it is not fair and frank in a man calling witnesses to give you these as though they were undoubted dates. However I am contented to take it that Justin Martyr was converted in 130, and I will take it that his works existed in A.D.140. Justin Martyr was a voluminous writer, but the truth of the works published in his name have since been abandoned as forgeries by Christians themselves. And then when Mr. Roberts was referring to Justin Martyr, why did he not tell you that the famous Paul, of whom he talks so much, is never once

named by Justin Martyr in any one of his writings. Why did he not tell you that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as writers of gospels, are never once named by Justin Martyr in any one of his writings? Why did he not go on to tell you that Justin Martyr repeatedly uses language to show that whatever gospels he had, it was evident he did not have ours, for he talks of the father, or rather the husband of the mother of Jesus as putting up in a cave. He talks of fire kindled in Jordan at the baptism of Christ, which does not come out of the Four Gospels. He talks of Jesus whilst amongst men making works of carpentry, as ploughs and yokes, which clearly don't come out of the Four Gospels. But I won't weary you and waste your time by further referring to Justin Martyr. It is clear that whatever books Justin Martyr had, he does not mention the gospels. He does not, excepting in one passage, use the word interpreted "gospel", and that is an interpolation. He never mentions Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; and the famous Paul is not mentioned from first to last.

I will pass on to the next matter Mr. Roberts mentions. He says that a forgery is an attempt to imitate, and must be an attempt to imitate some valuable document. But if that be true, in what position is Mr. Roberts placed? I have here a list of fifty or sixty writings which have been abandoned as forgeries — books published as Acts; books published as Gospels; books published as Epistles. I may have time to read the list to you, but at present I only refer to it. But if Mr. Roberts' contention is true, the existence of a false gospel of Barnabas would be evidence of an imitation of a true gospel of Barnabas; and if the contention has not that value, then it has no value at all. I ask you to remember that Justin Martyr's silence is important, because he does, in his writings, mention a revelation to John, and he mentions it in a peculiar, curious fashion, which, no doubt, you are thoroughly acquainted with, and I say the fact that Justin Martyr mentions that so distinctly shows that he could not have had others to mention, or he would have mentioned them with equal distinctness. I pass on to the next witness, Tatian. Mr. Roberts said he would quote to you from Tatian. There is not a scrap of Tatian existing except in a quotation of Eusebius, and it is utter pretence to carry you back in this fashion without explaining it to you. But what is the evidence of Tatian? It is the evidence of four gospels. If evidence at all, it is evidence against the Four Gospels we have. I have carefully compared the evidence, and I know exactly what I am saying. I say that the evidence is distinctly against the books and not in favour of them. We are told that Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect. Tatian's evidence is that what existed was only in Greek, and there is no evidence of there having been any translation at all or any sort of testimony as to the way it comes to us in the fashion it has done. Again he says of Mark, that Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, not in the order in which things were spoken or done by our Lord, for he never heard of or saw our Lord. What becomes, then, of the Four Gospels in the earlier part of the history? But it is a history composed in a fashion which precludes the possibility of the evidence of Tatian applying to it at all.

I now come to the alleged epistle of Polycarp, and I don't want to use any unduly strong language, but when people quote gospels and epistles as though they were not open to the slightest objection at all, they are dealing in a manner that is utterly unfair, and I urge that the evidence against the authenticity of the epistle of Polycarp has to be considered by anyone of those who take these things in hand for discussion at all, and I urge that the bulk of these epistles had to be abandoned as forgeries. A great German writer says the authenticity of this epistle has been called in question by a writer whom he names. The contents of them I will deal with presently. There is no evidence of anything about when Polycarp lived, and the authorised translators tell us that of Polycarp's life little was known. The whole story of his martyrdom is spurious and forged, and when you quote him, if I admit the evidence is true, I ask what have you got about Matthew? What have you got about Mark? What have you got about Luke? or what have you got about John? Not a solitary single word, and in order to show you this, I will take one of your witnesses, Clement of Rome. Would you believe that the writers and translators of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the Rev. Dr. Donaldson and the Rev. F. Crombie, are obliged to tell you, in their introduction, that "who the Clement was to whom the writings are ascribed cannot, with absolute certainty, be determined." Mr. Roberts places Clement at A.D.30 or A.D.83. But taking Clement as presented to us, what does he prove? First, I submit to you if he proves anything, it is fatal to the Bible, for whatever he quoted was not in the Bible which we have, the authorised English translation, and I will give you my evidence; but before I do so, permit me to refer to Mr. Roberts' own case. He says Clement lived A.D.30, and this epistle was written A.D.83. Supposing that to be true, in the second chapter we have the passage: "Every timely honour and happiness were bestowed upon you, and my beloved did eat and drink, and waxed fat and wicked." This was said of a people which Mr. Roberts says were a persecuted race. Because honour and happiness were bestowed upon them they eat and grew fat — these followers of Christ, before there were any infidels to corrupt them at all. Again, he said, "I am but the smoke of a pit." Find me that within the cover of this book! Then, I say, the book he has proved is not the book we are discussing before this audience. But Mr. Roberts has given us the evidence of the resurrection. Let his own witness talk about the resurrection. In chapter 25 he says, "Let us consider the wonderful scenes of the resurrection which take place in eastern lands. There is a certain bird that is called the phoenix. There is only one of the kind, and it lives 500 years, and when the time of dissolution draws near, that it must die, it builds a nest of frankincense and myrrh, into which it enters and dies." He then describes the process of the bird rising from its ashes, and that is the kind of nonsense to prove the Bible true. But let us see what is the evidence of Clement, and I refer Mr. Roberts now to Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History — book 3, c.38; book 2, c.1 — and I say he will find Eusebius there speaking with the same authority of the other writings of Clement, which have since been abandoned as forgeries. How dare Mr. Roberts pretend to talk of Clement, when

he produces no witnesses; for those he quoted were not witnesses; they were only people who spoke from hearsay, like Tom who heard Dick say he knew William's grandmother 50 years ago. (Hisses.) You do quite right to hiss, because the evidence can only be answered in that fashion. You do well to hiss, because you show that the sharp point of the blade has been thrust right through your advocate, and that you are afraid of hearing me. You do well to hiss, because it shows that your witnesses have been turned out by judge and jury with bad characters, and we cannot indict them for perjury, because they do not exist. Now we come to Hermas and Barnabas, but it would be dealing unfairly with two such reputable witnesses to waste the end of my speech upon them, and I shall occupy the few minutes that remain to me by commenting on the commencement of Mr. Roberts' speech this evening. He said the existence of the Jews was required on the hypothesis of the truth of the Bible. So I say is the existence of Mahomedans required on the hypothesis of the truth of the Koran. So the existence of the Mormons is required in confirmation of the truth of the story of Joseph Smith. So the existence of fire-worshippers proves the truth of the founder of their story, and the existence of the followers of Confucius to the truth of his works. And so I might go all through. These are simply the verbal phrases of nonsense which have been too much used. I don't deny the Jews. I don't deny that they had sacred books. Every people have their sacred books. The question I have discussed is, does the Bible contain an authentic revelation to man? Mr. Roberts says that I have dealt entirely with the internal evidence, and that I have not dealt with the external — that I have not dealt with the existence of an ecclesiastical tyranny. I cannot distinguish much difference in this particular between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and the Nonconformists persecuting the Quakers in New England. Our friends of the Church of Rome as well as of the Church of England have been found in opposition to progress and education. That is why I impeach the book; that is why I impeach Rome. But it is no question of taking an ecclesiastical tyranny alone, if you tell me it is the out-growth of the book. By their fruits ye shall know whether the book is the book of truth. You tell me of a tree planted 1,800 years ago, and you tell me to come under its branches. I show you wars and murders, anathematising and persecution. I shake your rotten tree, and I say, "Look at the fruit." (Hisses.)

The CHAIRMAN: You do quite wrong to hiss, and you do quite wrong to cheer. You would do quite right to remain quiet and listen to the arguments. Mr. Roberts will now have the option of speaking for a quarter of an hour, or of questioning Mr. Bradlaugh, who will subsequently have the same opportunity.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. BRADLAUGH.

85 Does the Koran foretell the existence of Mahomedanism at a period 3,000 years after its establishment? — I think not.

Then in what sense does the hypothesis of the Koran's truth require the existence of Mahomedanism at the end of a similar time? — At what time?

3,000 years after the writing of the Koran? — 3,000 years have not elapsed since the date of Mahommed. Therefore I cannot answer the question.

Then I will change the date to 1876, and repeat my question? — If you will repeat it, I will try to answer.

In what way does the hypothesis of the truth of the Koran require that we should find Mahomedans in existence now? — The supposition may be equally devised for any religious system embraced by so many millions of people.

Does the Koran foretell that Mahomedanism should exist centuries after its production? — I cannot challenge my memory.

I must ask you to try and remember? — My copy of the Koran is at home. I will look by to-morrow night.

I have a copy here (handing the book to Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. Bradlaugh sits down and turns over the book). — Go on with your questions.

No; I cannot while you are reading. — Oh, I can answer you quick enough.

Excuse me, Mr. Bradlaugh: I must wait till we have disposed of the present question. Read and I will wait. — I will, and perhaps I may find some things useful to both of us. (Turns over the book). Go on with your questions.

I must wait till you find the place. — I said I was not aware of any text capable of being so construed in the Koran, but you can go on. (Keeps turning over the leaves.)

Allow me to ask you to put down the book if I am to go on? — I will answer your questions. I was going to give you a text which I think will conflict with the other book a little. I think that you will find that the Koran, chapter 24, provides for the better treatment of slaves than the Bible does in Leviticus, chapter 25. There are other things I will find if you will give me time.

That is not to the point at present. I now ask you whether you are aware that the Bible foretells the existence of the Jews till the end of time? — I am not aware of it.

Will you allow me to present you with evidence? — You have a right to do what you please. You have a right to occupy a quarter of an hour.

I now quote from the 30th chapter of Jeremiah and the 10th and 11th verses:—
“Fear thou not, O my servant Jacob; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for lo, I will

save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid. For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee: *though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee*, yet will I NOT MAKE A FULL END OF THEE: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished." I ask upon that, whether the existence of the Jews does not bear out the hypothesis of that being a true prophecy? — No, because in Genesis God made an equally kind promise which He did not keep, and I have no means of estimating one more than the other.

Give me a promise He did not keep. — More than one. In Genesis chapter 12, verse 7: "And the Lord appeared unto Abraham and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land;" and again, Genesis chapter 13, verse 15: "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward and eastward. For all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever." I say the Jews have not had it for ever.

So you say; but is that a proof that they won't? — Yes it is, because it is said, "To thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever", and, clearly, as some years must be taken off the "ever", it cannot be fulfilled.

You said you were going to give me a case of a promise not fulfilled? — I will give you a dozen.

Let us keep to the one you have adduced at present. You think God has not fulfilled what he promised to Abraham. Is it not possible it may yet be fulfilled? — No; because the words are, "I will give it thee for ever", &c., and if the Jews are not in existence there, it is quite clear, according to your own contention, that they have not had it for "ever".

That is to say "for ever" when they get it under the promise? — But it is said, "To thee (Abraham) will I give it". Abraham never had an inch of it.

Are you aware that he is to have it when Christ comes to establish his kingdom upon the earth? — I don't know what will happen when Christ comes.

If you are not acquainted with what will happen when Christ comes, are you in a position to speak of an unfulfilled promise? — Yes. The land was given to Abraham and his whole seed. Abraham did not get it, and several generations have not got it; and it is clearly unfulfilled as far as they are concerned.

But if Abraham and his seed have it for ever at a future time, will not the promise be fulfilled? — No; because it won't be 'ever' after the promise.

It will be 'ever' after its fulfilment. The 'ever' begins with its fulfilment surely? — It will be several ages short of ever.

Well, we will leave that. Do I understand you to deny that the Christians suffered persecution in the first century? — I have no evidence of the existence of persecution. I only find your own witness saying they received "honour and happiness, did eat, drink, become fat and kicked."

Do you believe that Tacitus lived and wrote in the first century? — I forget the exact date of Tacitus' writings. I have no doubt he lived and wrote about that date.

Are you aware that Gibbon admits the authenticity of the writings of Tacitus? — Gibbon was a Christian, and I am not. I have read Gibbon and I have read Tacitus. Gibbon lived 1600 years after Tacitus. You have Gibbon on your side, but Gibbon was a Christian gentleman, and I am an Atheist gentleman. I may say I don't lay particular weight on the era of Tacitus' writings. I believe it was at the close of the first century.

Do you admit he wrote? — No doubt.

Do you admit what Tacitus declares, that Nero, in order to stifle the rumours that he set Rome on fire, ascribed it to a people "called by the vulgar Christians", whom he persecuted greatly? Do you admit that was in the first century? — I don't think it was. It is not noticed by Eusebius, and he would not have circulated the turbid writings of Josephus if he had had to his hand the writings of Tacitus. That is only my opinion, and I am corroborated by knowing that our "Christian Evidence" people altered every book they could.

Do you endorse this: "The most sceptical" — What are you reading?

I will tell you when I have read it:—"The most sceptical are obliged to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, and the integrity of this passage" from Tacitus. Do you admit that Gibbon wrote that? — I do.

Do you admit Gibbon to be a first-rate authority? — It may be that Eusebius had Tacitus to his hand. If so, it is most extraordinary that he missed that passage, if it existed, and circulated one which all intelligent men abandon as a forgery.

Supposing Gibbon says the Christians were persecuted in the first century, would you believe that they then existed? — I am inclined to think that the people whom you call persecuted Christians existed before that.

How far back would you take them? — I don't know how far back: Philo takes them back before the first century.

Do you take the name of Christ in connection with them back before that time? — At least 1,000 years before that time.

Do you mean to say that you find people called Christians before the first century? — That is not the question you asked me.

That is my question. — I don't know. I do find the name of Christ.

How came the name of Christ to be associated with the body of Christians? — I don't know.

Do you admit it has become so associated? — Yes.

And associated some time between A.D.150 and A.D.1? — I have no means of forming an opinion.

Then you deny this extract from Tacitus? — That is not the way of putting it. You asked me a question and I frankly answered it. You asked me the position of Tacitus. I answered by giving my reasons for what I think it was. But my reasons don't go any further than my own expression of disbelief, and don't go the length of absolute denial, but they put upon you the burden of proving it.

As a reasonable gentleman, I ask what have you reason to believe on the subject? — I find that the author Eusebius don't quote it. The whole of the early ages abounded in forgeries, and I cannot think so important a statement would have been missed.

Do you think Josephus wrote about the same time? — I should think about the same time or a little earlier.

Are you aware that Josephus quotes Tacitus? — Yes, but not for Christ, and he cannot have missed so important a corroboration. There was no need of putting the forged testimony of Josephus if the real evidence was to be found in Tacitus.

Are you aware that Josephus quotes that passage in Tacitus concerning Nero's destruction of Rome? — I am not aware that he quotes it as from Tacitus.

MR. BRADLAUGH QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

Will you please find me the quotation in which Josephus speaks about Jesus? — Mr. R. (reading): "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it is lawful to call him a man, for he was a great doer of miracles."

Do you find a word there about Tacitus? — No.

What do you mean by saying Josephus quoted Tacitus? — I did not say so as to this passage.

I quite misunderstood you, then. I certainly believed you to imply that a quotation from Tacitus was to be found in Josephus. If Mr. Roberts says I misunderstood him I only want it distinctly recorded. Will you please give your authority for saying that Clement of Rome was born A.D.30? — I have only the authority of the ancient writers.

Of whom? Name him. (Mr. Roberts turns to a book). If you are going to quote from Eusebius I will find you the chapter. — I have the Apochryphal New Testament published by Hone.

I am afraid Hone is not an ancient writer. I want an ancient writer, not one of this century. — William Hone's statements are based upon his researches into ancient manuscripts, and are to be accepted as credible.

William Hone's statement is not ancient? — He is not my only authority.

Give me your other. — I give you Milner.

Is he an ancient writer? I want an ancient writer. — He is a gentleman.

Mr. R., they are all gentlemen. I am not disputing that, I want an ancient writer. — He is a gentleman who conducted his investigations in the light of ancient works in the most searching manner.

That is no categorical answer to my question. The rules of this debate say that questions must be answered categorically, and to answer me by explaining who Milner is, is not categorical. I don't want modern writers, because they only base their statements upon something else. If you tell me you have only read modern writers, I can understand. Have you read the ancient authority? If you have not read the original writing, have you read translations from books such as are prepared from the original language? I don't want your "Christian Evidence" mongering works of modern times. I want the original authorities. Tell, me have you any others you have taken the pains to refer to? — Not on the question of Clement's age.

Have you in relation Barnabas? — My answer must be the same.

Hermas, Irenaeus, Mileto? — My answer must be the same in all these cases.

Justin Martyr? Do you mean to say that you have formed your judgment upon ancient matters without taking the trouble to go back to the ancient writers? — I have gone through a number of ecclesiastical histories.

What ancient ones? — Ecclesiastical histories are not ancient.

Yes, there are some? — What do you mean by "ancient"?

I am asking questions. It is your duty to answer them. I mean by "ancient" relating to the period of the writers whose names you have used. — Precisely so. I have given an answer. In some cases, I have referred to the first authorities.

Name one to whom you have referred to in relation to this discussion? — I have not referred to original documents.

Nor have I, but I have been to the best translations, and I want to know if you have taken the trouble to do that. Tell me what edition of Justin Martyr you have used? — I have already observed that I have in some cases referred to the first authorities, and others I have taken second-hand on the authority of credible gentlemen.

What do you mean by "some cases"? — I cannot be more explicit.

Have you a translation of Melito? — Having said "some cases", allow me to state the cases. There is the case of Barnabas; there is the case of Hermas; there is the case of Polycarp, of Clement, of Ignatius. You had better take my general answer, in the way I put it, viz., that I have not found it necessary to refer to original authorities for well-vouched statements.

I want an honest answer, and not a general answer which avoids it. — My answer is that. In the main my information is second-hand. I have read translations of the original authorities in the cases I have mentioned.

As you have mentioned translations, is every statement of Clement true within your knowledge? — Not recollecting the whole of them, I cannot answer. I may say in brief that I refer to them merely for a question of facts. Even an idiot can speak to facts.

Is there any one you can recollect which was not true? — I think I cannot say yes.

Can you say no? — I cannot say no at the moment.

You mean to say that in the speech I made three quarters of an hour ago, although I read Clement, you do not know whether it is true or not? — You read in so hurried and incoherent a fashion that I have a difficulty in making out what you do say.

I shall not ask any more questions. (Mr. Bradlaugh sits down.)

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Roberts will now speak for a quarter of an hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: I said in my opening speech that I did not require the testimony of these men whom I have been compelled to produce, in order to be persuaded that the apostles wrote the New Testament at the time they professed to have done so. I think the internal evidence is so convincing that no man of clear, calm, patient, unbiassed intellect can fail, in the reading of it, to be persuaded of that fact. A good illustration of this just occurs to me. A certain sceptical gentleman some years ago, speaking with an infidel friend, said that if anybody wanted a cure for infidelity, he would be certain to find it in the reading of the Bible every day for one year. The prescriber of the advice was not consistent enough to carry it out in his own case; but he has since done so, as the result of his attention having been called to a new, or at all events, non-orthodox interpretation of the Bible, and that gentleman is now a believer in the word of God. My anxiety is to bring to bear the argument leading to that result, to so present before you the internal characteristics of the Bible as a whole, as to show you that it is a divine book, and cannot be a human book. I can only do this in a brief form. I will lay before you examples of the Bible's uniform depreciation of human nature — a peculiarity which is characteristic of the Bible alone. We have in the 8th Psalm this enquiry made: "What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?" In Psalm 144 a similar question is asked and answered in this way: "Man is like to vanity: his days are like a shadow which passeth away." In the 40th chapter of Isaiah we read: "The voice said Cry; and he said, What shall I cry?"

All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the Spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it; surely the people is grass." Isaiah 2, last verse: "*Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?*" Ezekiel 36:22nd verse: "*Not for your sakes, O house of Israel*", that is, not for their sakes would he bring them from all the nations among whom they were scattered. "I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but *for my holy name's sake*, which ye have profaned among the heathen whither ye went." In the 17th of Jeremiah, at the 5th verse, we read: "*Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm . . . but blessed is the man that putteth his trust in the Lord.*" In the 9th of Jeremiah, 23rd verse: "*Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me.*"

I mean to contend upon these quotations, which are but a specimen of the universal character of the Bible, that no book, pervaded by such sentiments of depreciation towards man, could have a merely human authorship. I base this contention on the tendency of all writers, whether ancient or modern, Jew or Gentile, to glorify human nature, and boast in human achievements. All human writers, without exception, run in the line of thought illustrated in Mr. Bradlaugh's *National Reformer*, which speaks of the dignity of manhood and the greatness of human nature.

Then we have no parallel in any human writing to the constant exaltation of God as the great object of all arrangements and operations. "This people", for instance, we read, referring to the Jews, "have I formed for myself: they shall show forth all my praise." Again, consider this: 1 Cor. 1st chapter 26th verse: "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called; but *God hath chosen the foolish things of the world* to confound the wise; and *God hath chosen the weak things of the world* to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world and things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; THAT NO FLESH SHOULD GLORY IN HIS PRESENCE." This is not a sentiment native to human nature. Human sentiment always runs in a contrary direction. Man always chooses the powerful, the great, the rich, the mighty, the noble, for the accomplishment of any schemes he may conceive, as we see in all other religions throughout the whole world in every country and in every age. If the Bible were a human production, it would be characterised by human sentiments with regard to human nature; for it is an absolutely universal characteristic of man to glory in man and to boast in his own or somebody else's wisdom, riches, glory and might. The Bible runs directly counter to human feelings and sentiments in this matter, throughout its entire contents. This is inexplicable if it is a human production: but if the Bible be the reflect of divine views communicated by the Spirit of God to the writers, there is an explanation, instant and entirely satisfactory.

Then we have the perfect modesty of all the men who took a part in the development of Bible things; that is, modesty as regards any credit for the part they performed. I will give you a few illustrations of this. In the 3rd chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and the 12th verse, Peter says: "Why look ye so earnestly upon us *as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?*" Is it not the tendency in human nature, acting by itself, to take the credit of any gift possessed and to glory of it and make it the means of honour and personal consequence? No one with the history of mankind before him can deny this; but here are men who refuse the credit, as in the case recorded in the 14th of Acts: "Sirs, why do ye these things? *We also are men of like passions with you*, and preach unto you that ye should *turn from these vanities* UNTO THE LIVING GOD." Again, in the 10th of Acts and at the 25th verse we read: "And as Peter was coming in Cornelius met him" (Cornelius having sent for him by divine direction), "and fell down at his feet and worshipped him; but Peter took him up, saying, *Stand up; I myself also am a man*". In 1st Cor. 15:9, we find Paul saying: "For I am the least of the Apostles that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God." In Exodus 16:8, Moses, speaking of the murmurings of the people says: "*What are we?* Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord." In Numbers 11:29, Moses, when told deprecatingly by Joshua that somebody else had received the Spirit, replied: "Enviest thou for my sake? *Would GOD all the Lord's people were prophets* and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them." In Daniel 2:30, Daniel, when cited before Nebuchadnezzar to explain a dream which had baffled the magicians, prefaced his explanation by these words: "As for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom I have more than any living, but for their sakes that shall make known the interpretation to the king, and that thou mightest know the thoughts of thy heart." Now, if Daniel had been an impostor, like all other impostors, he would have placed his own credit in the front rank; instead of that, he says the explanation he is about to give is not due to his superior wisdom, but to communication from God. That is the utterance of a true man, who knew that the information was not out of his own head, but that he had received it from external sources. If so, the divine character of what he said is proved. Then there is the case of Joseph in Gen. 12:15, 16. Joseph was standing before Pharaoh under similar circumstances, and was called upon to explain an enigmatical dream. Pharaoh said to him: "I have heard say of thee that thou canst understand a dream to interpret it. And Joseph answered Pharaoh saying, *It is not in me; GOD SHALL GIVE PHARAOH AN ANSWER OF PEACE.*" Coming down to Christ himself we see the same peculiarity. What does he say concerning the miracles he wrought and wisdom he spake? "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works." — (John 14:10). "I am come in my Father's name." — (John 5:43.) And again "Of mine ownself, I can do nothing." — (John 5:30.)

Now, although this argument may not tell in an excited public meeting, yet in the calm hours of anxious thought, I am certain its full weight will be felt by those who are capable of appreciating an argument. It goes more than anything to show that the men who had to do with the transactions involved in the Scriptures and the writing of them were true men, and not such men as Mr. Bradlaugh would represent them to be; though, by the way, he has not given us his idea very distinctly. I should like to hear him define what he thinks they were. He does not consider them designing or ignorant men. Were they honest and enlightened men, then? If so, is not the Bible an authentic and reliable record of divine revelation? The circumstances in which they were concerned were of that character that the men must either have been true or knowingly and deliberately false. They were not like questions of opinion, in which a man may be mistaken without being insincere. The matters to which they stood related were matters of fact, in which the transactors of them must have known positively whether their professions were true or false. And those professions were at the very time put, in many instances, to so severe a test, as to have dispelled any mist of doubt.

Let me give a single affecting illustration in the case of Jeremiah; and, by the way, this bears upon a point which it is well to notice. Mr. Bradlaugh tauntingly asked how he was to distinguish between the false prophet and the true. I answer they may both be distinguished by a simple test. In fact, they are to be distinguished the one from the other on the very principle by which I have sought to demonstrate the divine character of the Bible. The Bible speaks uncomplimentarily of human nature; all other books speak well of it. So the true prophets went against the popular current in denouncing popular sins, while the false prophets "spoke smooth things".—(Isa. 30:10). This peculiarity of the false prophets is illustrated in the following citation: Jeremiah 23:16: "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you; they make you vain; they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despise me, *The Lord hath said, ye shall have peace*; and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you." The disagreeable result of a true testimony is illustrated even in Jeremiah's case on the occasion when he was inclined to hold his peace. He said: "The word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me and a derision daily. Then I said, *I will not make mention of Him, nor speak any more in His name.*" The thing he said was a disagreeable thing, and brought upon him an attempt, on the part of the rulers of Jerusalem, to destroy his life; and then he makes this pathetic appeal to the princes and the people, which we find in Jeremiah 26:12, and in which the truthfulness of his profession is apparent: "The Lord sent me to prophesy against this house and against this city all the words that ye have heard. Now, therefore, amend your ways and your doings, and obey the voice of the Lord your God, and the Lord will repent Him of the evil that He hath pronounced against you. *As for me, behold I am in your hand; do with me as seemeth good and meet unto you.* But know ye

for certain, that if ye put me to death, ye shall surely bring innocent blood upon yourselves and upon this city, and upon the inhabitants thereof: *for of a truth the Lord hath sent me unto you to speak all these words in your ears.*”—(Time called.)

92 Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts, in his first speech, said he had a large number of witnesses, and that he could read from them, chapter and verse. For I challenged him to do so — that will be in the memory of all of you. I challenged them in very explicit terms; and instead of venturing to read a line of any of them he has occupied himself by reading texts from the Bible. I went through the witnesses, and I put it to you, that although I could not possibly guess what his first speech would be, that I dealt with the majority of them there and then, and he has not ventured to pretend that any one of my statements was untrue. But the difficulty is that if mine were true, his were not accurate. He said to you, when he was talking about Tatian, Theophilus, Athenagoras and Mileto, that he had got these and would read them if Mr. Bradlaugh challenged him. Mr. Bradlaugh did challenge him, and he has not read them, and will never read them during this debate. I carefully distinguished between what he could read and what he could not. I took one writer, Clement, whom he could have read. Clement I have read not at second-hand but in a translation. If he had read Clement, as I quoted Clement, does he mean to say I did not read the passages of Clement distinctly enough for him to know their truth or falsehood? Mr. Roberts ought to have known Clement and the others, or he ought not to have challenged me to debate. Mr. Roberts says he had taken his information from reliable writers. My objection is that the mass of writers who wrote on the side of Christianity is not reliable. We may take a few men and agree with Lardner as to their credibility. I believe that Lardner writes thoroughly, earnestly, and honestly, and although I don't agree with reference to his ancient authority when Lardner's opinion is distinct and complete with regard to it, he is entitled to some respect. But when I find a man like Paley convicted of receiving information at second and third hand, and making blunders, do you think somebody ought to pass muster whose information comes at third or fourth hand? It is not reasonable; it is fencing with an empty scabbard — not fencing at all. In his last speech, Mr. Roberts says he does not need external evidence; then he should not call it. If that was the case, our friend in his first speech should not have tried it. I have only found this that my opponent has offered to advance evidence with this curious result, that all through I have always been right and we have not heard Mr. Roberts right in one instance. Take Solomon in the writer Josephus, the Proverbs in the writer Josephus. When he got Josephus, although Mr. Roberts was ready with explanations, there was not a word about Solomon or the Proverbs in the quotation. Mr. Roberts says I misapprehended him about Josephus and Tacitus, and I am bound to accept what he said; but I cannot imagine what he meant by asking me about Josephus and

Tacitus. The question was what Josephus had written about Tacitus? and if it was not put with that object, then it was an attempt at bewilderment on the part of the questioner. At present I take it he has been misinformed. He did not quote Tatian to you. He has not read a line from Tatian, and he never will. In my speech I referred him to the only authors he could get references from. If he likes he can have my books, and I think I can supply him from my own little library with such English translations as exist of every one, not only of the people whose works are supposed to be whole, but of such extracts as are supposed to be prepared not from infidel sources — for I don't go to infidel sources — but from Christian sources.

Where are we about to go in this debate? Mr. Roberts first says there is external evidence. So there is. Now quote it and see what it is worth! But he cannot even do that. And, then, again I appeal to my friends, and I appeal to Mr. Roberts, whether he thinks the way to convince me that this book is God's authentic revelation, is by quoting to me writers I am better acquainted with than he is, and who don't say a word of what he thinks they say. It might do with somebody who never debated at all, but it doesn't do with me. Now what have we? We have a statement that we must account for Christianity, and in accounting for Christianity we may be very simple. Every religion in the world is the result of growth more than of fraud. There are some few cases, but very few, in the world, in which people have been utterly fraudulent. But the truth of cases in which men make headway, are cases in which they have had strong convictions — very often believe themselves to be thoroughly in the right, and although I may think them utterly wrong, it is not an impeachment so much of their *morale* as it is of their accuracy in dealing with these things. I do not regard Johanna Southcote as I would a woman not misled by enthusiasm. It does not follow because I do not regard a book as true, therefore I regard it as a directly fraudulent manufacture. The Pantheisms of the world, the religions of the world, the superstitions of the world — call them what you will — have not been the product of special men at a special moment. They have been the outcome of special organisations, and with different types of men we obtain different types of religion. It is only some men who have never been out of some Christian Evidence volume — with a large amount of "evidence" at fourpence a volume — it is only such men who put to you the conclusion of absolute fraud and forgery, or of absolute truth. All the religions of the world have some truth in them. I don't deny there have been good Christians; but when I am to have the apostles put to me for examples of perfect modesty, and Peter, of all people, quoted as "modest Peter", I must give you an illustration of Peter's modesty. Peter to whom God had revealed, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven." How does "modest Peter" then get on when his master was being despitefully used? "Modest Peter" declared "I know not the man"; with an oath, "I know not the man". "But surely you were of the company", says a bystander: "Damn you, I don't know the man". That is your

“modest Peter”. If that was modesty, then Tatian was evidence. But let us, if you please, see what we are to do? External evidence — very inconvenient when it is to touch internal evidence. Very inconvenient! “Mr. Bradlaugh talks so quickly and incoherently”. Then I will talk slowly about the internal evidence, and will remind you that this divine revelation says that John did know Jesus, and that he did not know him at one and the same moment of time; we have not been honoured with an explanation of that; nor of his own witness, Justin Martyr, saying that a fire was kindled in the river Jordan just at the moment of the baptism. He has not answered about three days happening between late on Thursday evening and before Saturday was over. He has not answered whether it was one woman, or two women, or more than two women, who went first to the grave. He has not answered the slight contradiction between Luke 24 and Acts 1, as to 40 days Christ was said to be upon the earth after the resurrection. He has not answered any one of the mass of contradictions which have been pointed out, and although I may talk quickly I talk tolerably clearly; and if he imagines the Bible to be true, I can only say I wish him quicker wit when he challenges me another time. But we have had sneers at infidelity and references to the *National Reformer* — not a bad journal. I did not introduce it; Mr. Roberts did. It is a very good journal; there is a great deal of sensible writing in it to my taste. It happens to contain in the volume for 1867 the whole of the evidence which Mr. Roberts has referred to to-night, all turned down. He could read it from there. He would do right to refer to it, and it would have saved him from some blunders. Then he talked of infidelity. What is infidelity? The world calls me infidel, and I am not ashamed. What is an infidel? If it is to be unfaithful to my views, then I am not. If it is to be unfaithful to my convictions, then I am not. If it is to be unfaithful to my country, then I am not. If it is to be unfaithful to the redemption of the human race, then I am not. If it consists in disbelieving that God made a damnation trap to catch all the human race in, then I am an infidel. I have used no hard words against Mr. Roberts. The word infidel came several times from him. I am content to argue out this question without the slightest resort to verbal retaliation. But I carry two swords and it depends upon those who fight me which one I fight with. I am ready to fence with the rapier, and I can handle the two-handed broad-sword too, and if wielding the two-handed weapon is necessary, I wield it. At the last moment, before I sit down, I remind Mr. Roberts that he professed to have upon the platform the writings of Tatian, Theophilus and others. He has not quoted them, and cannot quote them, and never will quote them throughout this discussion.

Mr. ROBERTS: It suits Mr. Bradlaugh’s purpose to make these statements, but it would not suit my purpose to do what he challenges me to do, because — and he knows that well — in pursuing these unimportant enquiries, I would be prevented from doing other things which I am more particularly intent upon doing, and which are of far more consequence, and that is the exhibition before you of

positive evidences which establish my proposition. Nevertheless, I affirm that I have produced the authorities he asks for. They are on the platform now, and if Mr. Bradlaugh will consent to the appointment of a committee of gentlemen, they will investigate the truth of my statement.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (pointing to the audience): Here is the committee.

Mr. ROBERTS: Meanwhile I shall do my part, and that part is to prove my case. It is no way of proving the case to combat difficulties in detail. Nevertheless I am prepared to combat all these difficulties. Let Mr. Bradlaugh give me the opportunity by accepting a challenge for another six nights, in which he will undertake to affirm that the Bible is a forgery, or a mass of sincere nonsense, or whatever else he likes to affirm it to be. In such a discussion I would be free to follow him in all his arguments. Meanwhile it is his part to follow me. I have to deal with positive evidence, and my dealing with it prevents me doing all he would like me to do.

Before I proceed further, I will fulfil the promise I made the last time we were together, that I would give evidence of the existence of the law of Moses at Shiloh for a period of centuries. The process of proof consists in reading certain texts out of the Bible. Mr. Bradlaugh does not like so much Bible reading. I can only say that more weight attaches to the contents of the Bible itself than to the ephemeral, worthless sayings of contemporary witnesses to the fact of the Bible's existence. The first I shall quote are the directions of Moses to the priests (Deuteronomy 31:9), "And Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel". In the 25th verse of the same chapter, Moses gave these directions: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." Not "in the ark", as Mr. Bradlaugh suggested the other night, making it an objection that the place would not be large enough; but near it — by the side of it, in a manner we should understand if we had an exact knowledge of its surroundings. Then we have the information that the ark followed Joshua and the Israelites. Joshua 3rd chapter, 17th verse:—"And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until all the people were passed clean over Jordan." In the 18th chapter of Joshua and the 1st verse we have:—"And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at SHILOH, and *set up the tabernacle of the congregation there.*" The tabernacle of the congregation included all that constituted it, and one of those items was the ark and the law written by Moses. We find the tabernacle still at Shiloh in the days of Samuel (1 Sam. 1:3; 3:15-21; 4:4), which was at least four centuries after it was set up by Joshua. I now proceed to show that the law was in the custody of the priests, and that it was their duty to teach it. In the 33rd chapter of Deuteronomy, 10th verse, we read: "The Levites shall *teach* Jacob Thy judgments, and Israel *thy law*; they shall put incense before

thee and whole burnt sacrifice upon thine altar.” In the reign of Jehoshaphat, we read (2 Chron. 17:8) that he sent Levites to teach in the cities of Judah. “And they taught in Judah, and *had the book of the law of the Lord with them*, and went about through all the cities of Judah, and taught the people.” Again (Mal. 2:7), “The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should *seek the law at his mouth*.” The conclusion deducible from these promises is that the priests had the law in their possession at Shiloh. I don’t attach any importance to the point; but having promised to prove it, I have fulfilled my promise, and must now proceed to the futher illustration of the argument which it is my duty to unfold.

Before I do so, I would notice the statement of Mr. Bradlaugh, that superstitions and religion — which he seems to regard as interchangeable terms — are the outgrowth of ages, the result of climate, and of natural peculiarities. He says that religion is not the product of particular men, or of particular circumstances. That may be true with regard to superstitions, which are not worth discussing, but it is not true with regard to the religion of the Bible. The religion of the Bible is, in a secondary sense of course, the work of particular men, and the offspring of particular circumstances of the most definite character. It is upon this, in fact, that I rely, as affording one of the most conclusive evidences of its truthfulness and divinity. It is very easy to talk of the “outgrowth of ages”, but this will carry no weight with those who are acquainted with the facts of the case. My argument is that there is a method in the growth of Bible religion which, when critically investigated, will show that it was a designed affair, and not an accidental development of superstitious or any other kind of sentiment. The work of Moses in Egypt and the wilderness, for forty years with the Jews; the life and sayings of the prophets that arose in Israel; the appearance and doings of Christ and his apostles in the beginning of the Christian era, are all matters of a definite, palpable, and historic character, connected with statements of fact which, if sustained, prove the divinity of Bible religion beyond question: and the writings produced by all these men, giving an account of their proceedings, are also matters of palpable evidence; and my contention is that an examination of all these things in connection with the effects which are now visible in the world before our eyes, in true process of logic, will yield the result that the religion of the Bible is not like the religion of the Brahmin or any other superstition of unenlightened ages or nations, but is directly due to the initiative of Almighty wisdom, and therefore a coherent, and rational, and elevating, and glorious system of truth, which has already, despite of Mr. Bradlaugh’s declaration to the contrary, immensely benefited the world, and given us a far higher civilisation than any other system is capable of doing, and which, in the hands of God, like the path of the just, will yet shine brighter and brighter unto the perfect day; for the world has not seen the last of the work of God on earth. The Bible informs us that Christ will re-appear and sweep away all the political nuisances which Mr. Bradlaugh tries in vain to reform, and establish a perfect system of government in the autocratic, infallible, and omnipotent despotism which Christ will give to the world. This, and not Republicanism, is the destined cure for the evils under which the world groans.

The incidents connected with the development of the work of Christ upon earth, to which Mr. Bradlaugh alluded, in my judgment, tell the other way from Mr. Bradlaugh's construction of them. I could not understand his logic about Peter. It seems to me that Peter's denial of Christ constitutes the greatest possible proof that Peter afterwards had good reason for preaching his resurrection. Not only so, but it is a positive evidence of the genuineness of the narrative. How came it to be recorded that Peter denied his Master? The very fact that we should have so distinct a record of Peter's denial of his Lord is a proof that the record is a Divine work; for if Christianity had been a human movement, the writers on its behalf would carefully have suppressed such a fact; and we have, in the very fact that such a man should be chosen as the principal apostle, another evidence of the Divine work; for men devising such a work would not have placed in the forefront the man who had disgraced himself most; but because there is a God, and because He so works that there is no room for human boasting, Peter who had so humbled himself, was placed in a position where another man might have been uplifted. God's authority and God's honour are placed in the forefront, when the work is in the hands of a man who has everything to be personally ashamed of and nothing to boast of. Therefore that Peter, the leader of the apostles, should be recorded as having denied Christ, to my mind, leads to an exactly opposite conclusion to that which Mr. Bradlaugh extracts from it. It is a peculiarity we find in other cases; for not only was Peter, who denied Christ, chosen as the mouthpiece of the apostles, but Paul who persecuted the Church, was used as the most influential and successful agent in the dissemination of the religion of Christ throughout the world. Mr. Bradlaugh is obliged to admit that the Christians were an extensive community at the end of the first century, and that they were persecuted for the name of Christ which they professed. This is established by the letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, and however he may try to obscure the bearing of the fact, here comes a problem which Mr. Bradlaugh says he is not bound to explain. It is a problem, the historic reality of which rests upon unquestionable grounds. The evidence I produce is not Justin Martyr, nor any of those other men with whose writings he is so particularly familiar, and who, in my judgment, are trashy writers. I rely upon historic facts, which Mr. Bradlaugh cannot overturn, and which his class have never been able to explain in harmony with their theory of Christ's resurrection being a myth. We know that men will not sacrifice everything and go to prison and death for a myth; but men did this for Christ, and Christ was commended to them on personally attested and solid facts. Paul said, "I preach unto you Christ. I have seen him. I give proof of his working with me in these signs and to you personally if you believe in him and obey him." If that is accepted, there is a reasonable explanation of the circumstance that vast crowds believed and submitted to disadvantage for their belief. But Mr. Bradlaugh says there never was a Paul. I call upon him to explain how it comes to pass that the vast community, whose existence he cannot historically deny, came into being without a Paul; and how that community, in all the ages of its existence, came to

believe in Paul? It is playing with the subject to go recklessly in the face of manifest truth. The New Testament explanation is a rational explanation. There is no other rational explanation. It shows the straits of unbelievers that Mr. Bradlaugh should have to suggest that the New Testament was a forgery, written A.D.150. It cannot be. How could it be? There were then large communities who would have been witnesses to the imposition. How could they, in various parts of the world, have been brought for the first time to accept as Paul's letters documents professing to have been written a hundred years before, but of which they had never heard anything till then for the first time? It is utterly contrary to all reason.

I have but a minute and a half, and I conclude by saying that the general character of the gospel teaching of Christ is of itself evidence of its divinity. For what is it? That by submitting to present denial in a variety of ways, without any hope of compensation in this present life, we may afterwards attain to a higher benefit which nobody can confer but God. Would any man have invented a doctrine like that? Would any man have deferred the hope of advantage to a remote and subsequent time as the benefit of present sacrifice? We have only to examine the whole range of human philosophy to see how utterly non-human such a system is.—(Time called.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts is good enough to tell you that I am extremely familiar with the early fathers. I am obliged to him for that admission. I wish I could return the compliment. He says they are "trashy", but he did not say so when he opened his first speech.

Mr. ROBERTS: I did.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: You did not. You said you had them, and I challenged you to read them off one after the other as if they were really good evidences. I say either you had not read anything whatever of the writings which you attribute to Tatian, to Theophilus, to Athenagoras, to Mileto, to Justin Martyr, and, in that case, you ought to have mentioned them, or you represented them to this audience, knowing they did not say what you pretended they did. That is the plain and simple issue. You have said they gave evidence which an idiot could give. I admit that, but they are not evidence for me. It is you who call idiotic witnesses. And now I am told I don't give you texts. Why the complaint has been that I gave so many texts. My familiarity with the fathers should have been anticipated, or I should not have deserved to have come to a debate of this kind. But now that I am familiar with them, they are trash. I agree they are trash, but they are your best evidence — your only evidence. If Mr. Roberts was not prepared to produce the writings of these fathers he should not have used their names. He says he cannot follow me. I took up everyone of them, one after another, and simply knocked each one of them to pieces. I think that was following them pretty closely. He says

he cannot understand my logic about Peter, if the stories were forged. He knows I don't pretend that the whole of the stories were forged. I have said that I consider the Christian myths have grown like other myths, and Mr. Roberts has not refuted the assertion. At the close of the first century Christians existed, I admit, to a large extent; but at the close of the 19th century more Mormons exist than there were Christians at the close of the first century. What does that prove? By my friend's argument it proves Mormonism. But in that case he will say that the men were foolish who built up the Mormon system, and that the success of Mormonism is no proof that the Bible is not true. I account for Christianity in the same way; I account for sun worship in the same way, and for the worship of the general forces of the world, and for the entire myths and superstitions which embody themselves under the names of different religions throughout the world. The clear and precise duty of Mr. Roberts in this debate was to have steered clear of external evidences, and if he thought a public audience was not the proper place to have tested Mileto, Tatian, Theophilus, & co., he should not have brought them before you at all, and should not have come before a public excited audience, but challenged me to a written debate, where there can be no excitement. Does he expect to become more familiar with these witnesses, because of my familiarity with them? He says they are trash. He says they are idiotic, and none but an idiot would give that kind of evidence.

Then we have now an attempt in words but not in truth to perform a promise which Mr. Roberts undertook, namely to show that the Pentateuch was in a place called Shiloh in the time of Joshua. That was the proposition which Mr. Roberts undertook to prove. He has quoted to you some texts saying that Moses wrote the law, but he has not identified the law with those five books at all, though much of the five books certainly was not law, and much of the five books could not by possibility have been written by Moses. He tried to trick the question about the Pentateuch being in the ark, and he jumped out of the frying-pan into the fire by saying the Pentateuch was not put into the ark, but in a place beside it. If the Pentateuch was not in the ark, what was the good of tracing the ark? If the Pentateuch was in place beside the ark we have nothing at all to do with the ark. Then he says as evidence that the Pentateuch was in the ark, or near to it, or by the side of it, and that a number of things mentioned in the law ought to be there. No doubt it ought to be if God revealed it; it would have been there, if God ordered it to be put there, but it is not there. For a long while it was not known to exist, and in the 2nd of Kings 22nd chap. and 8th verse, we read about somebody finding it. We learn from Eusebius that, in the captivity of the people under Nebuchadnezzar, the Scriptures were destroyed, and God inspired Ezra to write them afresh. I want external evidence; Mr. Roberts says it is trash, yet he brought it. You cannot have external evidence except you read it. You say you want internal evidence; yet if I quote the immorality of the book, you pass that by. If I refer to flat contradictions in the book, oh, Mr. Bradlaugh is incoherent. You spin the Acts of the Apostles by the yard, and then say Mr. Bradlaugh is to disprove it.

A debate of this kind might have been useful, but if I had known that my opponent knew no more of the common rudiments of the case than he has shown, I should have refused his challenge. I understood he was the representative of a respectable set of men. Some of those men I have come in contact with in America and England, and I have found to be honest men. I am not going to say hard things of them. I don't find idiots and shallow pates in those who have disagreed with me. My life has taught me that there are men not more shallow than myself (though I may not agree with them), and I have learned that the worst shallowness is to profess to be acquainted with learned authorities, relying upon the ignorance of untaught men who have taken the pains to know every scrap you can bring. Four nights of this debate have gone. If aught of proof has been given that this book is God's Divine message to man, I confess I have not heard it. I have only heard the speeches of a man who varies and twists, and shifts and turns, and then, with all his evidence upon the platform — here where he might have read it to you, where he said he would read it to you if challenged to do it — says he won't take up good time with doing so, or that he hasn't time to do it. It was not true; it was not honest; it was not fair. He said he would and did not, because it would only have proved he was ignorant of the subject. Friends, is this the way to prove God's truth? Then he sneers at Republicanism. Was that meant as a sneer to me? I am not ashamed of my Republicanism, and if I only wanted reasons to be republican, it would be when I found an ordained king like David, "a man who kept God's commandments and walked in the way that was right in His eyes", trampling on His people, robbing His people, murdering and betraying His people, ruining His people. I say that is enough to make any man republican. You tell me republicanism won't succeed. I don't know the relevancy it has to the argument, but I do place it against the lustful, lying, cowardly Brunswicks, and the wicked and lustful Bourbons. I place it against kings living upon the people — and against a sham of a book which sanctions such a system, without which it could not otherwise be defended. I have nearly done. I know you have men who could better plead in this cause than myself, but at any rate you have one here who has never made fight against what he conceives to be true, and never degraded the platform by manufacturing an argument for the purpose of defeating an opponent.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion will be continued to-morrow evening at the same hour.

Fifth Night,
WEDNESDAY, 21st JUNE, 1876,
IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM.

THE CHAIR WAS OCCUPIED BY MR. GEORGE H. ST. CLAIR

The CHAIRMAN: You will be familiar by this time with the order of discussion, which is the same each evening. Last night, I think we were less interrupted than on the previous occasion, and I trust, in this respect, you will apply the Christian exhortation, and go on to perfection. I have the pleasure to ask Mr. Roberts to open on the affirmative side.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.—Last night Mr. Bradlaugh said some rather hard things. They did not hurt me, however: firstly, because I am accustomed to such things; secondly, because, they were not true; and thirdly, because I rather think they indicate, on the part of Mr. Bradlaugh, a conscious weakness in the argument. But there is one thing Mr. Bradlaugh said to which I feel called upon to make allusion, lest my silence should be misconstrued. I refer to his denial of the statement I made at the beginning of last night's meeting — that I was prepared with chapter and verse to all the authors whose names I mentioned as contemporary witnesses of the existence of the New Testament, at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century. He denied that I had these evidences or had access to these writers. I, therefore, produce them, one by one, to the chairman; and I ask the chairman as a scholar and a gentleman —

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I object.

Mr. ROBERTS: As a scholar and a gentleman, I ask him to say whether or not these books produced justify my assertion, and constitute the proof which I allege. The chairman shall act as umpire, on a matter of fact like this, affecting, as it does, the veracity of the speaker. I produce, first, the seven epistles of Ignatius — the very epistles themselves, and not extracts from them by other writers. I produce the epistle of Barnabas. I produce the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. I produce the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians. They are all bound together with those other writings which constitute the apocryphal New Testament. Next, I produce *Milner's Church History*, which was also on the platform last night, in which Milner quotes largely from all these men. I next produce Reid's edition of *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, in which also are extensive allusions, particularly in Reid's footnotes, to those writers. I finally produce a compilation by Dr. Brewer, which brings the entire mass of the evidence to a focus, so to speak.

There is only one hypothesis on which I can imagine Mr. Bradlaugh can attempt to justify his assertion, or upon which I can understand it. He may have meant that I did not have in my possession the original books written by these men, that is, the actual manuscripts — the actual parchment on which they wrote. I never said I had. I don't suppose they are in existence, but this is no barrier to their reception. Mr. Bradlaugh has produced books. What if I said he did not produce them because he could not produce the actual caligraphic productions of the writers? He would say he had copies, which would be an answer. I claim equally the reception and use for the present argument of those books which I have produced. I have made no profession of learning in the matter. If there has been any profession of learning in the matter it has been on the other side of the platform entirely. The works I have alluded to, are such as are accessible to illiterate persons. Nevertheless, I contend they are conclusive evidence on the question as to whether or not the New Testament existed in the first century. My argument is that the New Testament must have existed then or these writers could not have quoted from it. And the force of that argument is not weakened by the fact that some of the writers believed in the Phoenix or any other nonsense. Nor is it affected by the suggestion that these letters of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, &c., may be forgeries: for even if forgeries, their existence is traceable to the first century, and their evidence of the existence of the New Testament at that time is all the same.

Having alluded to these matters which, I am sorry to have taken up so much of my half hour with, I propose returning to my affirmative argument, and to show that the history of the Jewish nation, particularly as involving the character and career of Moses, cannot be explained on the Free-thinkers' hypothesis, but is, on the contrary, an irrefragable proof of the divine character and authorship of the Scriptures. In this we are dealing to a certain extent with a palpable contemporary fact. There is such a nation extant in the world as the Jews, as Mr. Bradlaugh himself is compelled to admit. That nation is not of yesterday: its records go farther back into the remote dim regions of antiquity than those of any other nation under heaven, with the exception of the inscriptions on Egyptian and Assyrian remains and monuments, which are childish affairs compared with the magnificent writings of Moses. I must of course refer to those writings in elaborating the argument of this evening. That they are the writings of Moses is proved in several ways. First, there is the tradition of the Jews in all generations. They have said that Moses is the author of that book, and that of itself is a weighty, and in fact, conclusive argument, for how could such a reputation come to exist apart from the fact that Moses at the beginning did write them?

But it is said the Mahommedans are witnesses to the Koran. So they are; I admit it. And it is said the Mormons are witness to the writings of Smith. I admit it. But what have we then? We have a book admittedly written by Mahomet, and a book admittedly written by Joe Smith; but when we come to examine the books in the light of facts, we find evidence that Mahomet and Joe Smith are impostors. The

result is the same in a less degree in the works admitted to be the productions of Zoroaster, Confucius, and other ancient writers. The authenticity admitted, their undivine character is self-manifest. All I ask Mr. Bradlaugh is to concede a similar process of treatment to the writing of Moses. That is, admit its authenticity on the evidence on which he admits the authenticity of the Koran, and then examine the book. Let him admit that just as the authenticity of the Koran is proved by the universal consent of the Mahomedans, so the authenticity of Moses is proved by the universal consent of the Jews. And, then go to the investigation of the books and see whether or not the allegation that it is a divine revelation is proved by its very contents.

My next witness to the authenticity of the writings of Moses is Jesus of Nazareth, whom I have a right to call, because I have proved his resurrection by arguments which Mr. Bradlaugh has not attempted to upset. The testimony of a man proved to be the Son of God by resurrection from the dead, must be true. Jesus recognises Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. In John 5:46, He says:— “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for HE WROTE of me. But if ye believe not HIS WRITINGS, how shall ye believe my words?” In Luke 16:29, he puts these words into the mouth of a parabolic character:— “They have MOSES *and the prophets*; let them hear them. If they hear not MOSES and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.” In Luke 24:27, it is recorded concerning Christ that, after his resurrection, “beginning *at Moses* and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.” Logically this evidence is conclusive without anything else. But there is other evidence not so strong, which I produce, because Mr. Bradlaugh has a curious preference for the imperfect and blundering evidence of merely secondary writers, instead of going direct to the merits. I have already referred to Josephus. I have already shown that he (a careful, clear, and trustworthy writer) comes before us as a witness to the writings of Moses. It may be asked how did Josephus know? My answer is, Josephus was a man in office amongst the Jews, with access to all the means existing in the first century of forming a decision, and his writings show that he had the capacity for forming a just decision. The recognition of the writings of Moses by such a man, is of some weight in the scale. I have already referred to the Septuagint as a collateral evidence of value. I might also mention the Samaritan version, which was made from the original ages before even the Septuagint, from a desire on the part of the Samaritans to have the books of Moses in their own possession. All these are valuable collateral evidences of the authenticity of the book now in question.

But let us now go to the book itself. I will affirm that, if you take God out of the five books of Moses, those five books fall to pieces. They cannot be understood on the hypothesis that they were written by a man to glorify himself, his name, or his nation; or to serve any sinister purpose whatever, or human purpose of any kind, minister or otherwise. Let us look at the evidence of this. If

written by a man of his own notion, we know, from acquaintance with man universally, that the purpose would be to call attention to or create honour for somebody, or to serve some purpose congenial to human nature. Let us then test Moses by this hypothesis, by the hypothesis that his writings were merely a human production, and then you will see my meaning. If the object of Moses in the operation he conducted in connection with the Jewish nation was to make himself a great leader and make himself a great name, as Manetho says, it would have been necessary for him to conciliate the people by complimentary words, as all popular leaders in all ages have found it necessary to do and have done. He would speak to them pleasant things, and cheer them with prophecies of good. You will find that Moses did nothing of the sort, but indulged in language and assumed an attitude utterly inconsistent with any human object whatever. Let me draw attention to Deuteronomy 9, from the 4th to the 7th verses, and let me ask you to imagine either Moses or anyone else speaking thus while practising an imposture for the glorification of himself or the Jewish nation:— “Speak not thou in thine heart after that the Lord thy God hath cast them (the Canaanitish nations) out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee. *Not for thy righteousness or for the uprightness of thy heart* dost thou go to possess their land; but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them from before thee, and that he may perform the word which the Lord sware unto thy fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Understand, therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it *for thy righteousness*, FOR THOU ART A STIFF-NECKED PEOPLE. Remember, and forget not, how *thou provokedst the Lord thy God in the wilderness, from the day thou didst depart out from the land of Egypt; until ye came unto this place ye have been rebellious against the Lord.*” Is that the way a patriot speaks to the people whose suffrages he canvasses, or whose good opinion he aims to secure, that his name may be sent down with fame to posterity? Every man can answer that question for himself. We all know the language of men who aim at a personal object. They flatter and speak well of those whom they seek to use as instruments of their personal ambitions. Moses never did so. What I have read is only a mere sample of his style. Let any one read his writings, and they will find they are all in the same strain. If God sent and was with Moses, the style of his address is explained. If God did not appear to Moses, but Moses, out of his own head, sought to accomplish a personal object, such language is incomprehensible.

I must be content on that point and hurry on to something else. I will next ask: Did the people glorify Moses? Did they accept him as their leader? If this book was written in order to glorify Moses or to glorify the Jewish nation — if Jewish transactions in their beginnings were merely human performances, with which God had nothing to do, or if this book had been written afterwards to create confidence in a merely traditional Moses, without reference to truth, it would have been carefully shown that, at the beginning and during all his life, Moses was

accepted by the people; certainly, every circumstance tending to show rebellious conduct on the part of the people during all the circumstances attending their exodus from Egypt, and their passage through the wilderness, would have been suppressed. Instead of this, what do we find? Why, the people are described as in a state of continual revolt. Let me illustrate this by Exodus 16, 2nd verse:— “And they took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of Israel came unto the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt. And the whole congregation of the children of Israel *murmured against Moses* and Aaron in the wilderness; and the children of Israel said to them, Would to God we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh-pots and when we did eat bread to the full; for ye have brought us forth into this wilderness to kill this whole assembly with hunger.” Again, when the spies sent before to see the land to which they were journeying, took an evil report, we read (Num. 14:1-5; 2:22, 23) “And all the congregation then lifted up their voice and cried, and the people wept that night. And all the children of Israel murmured against Moses and against Aaron: and the whole congregation said unto them, would to God that we had died in the land of Egypt, or would to God we had died in this wilderness . . . Were it not better for us to return into Egypt? And they said one to another, Let us make a captain and let us return into Egypt. Then Moses and Aaron fell on their faces before all the assembly of the congregation of the children of Israel . . . And the Lord said unto Moses, how long will this people provoke me? and how long will it be ere they believe me for all the signs which I have showed among them? . . . Because all those men which have seen my glory and my miracles which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times and have not hearkened to my voice, surely they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers.”

Then there is the account of the conspiracy of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, who rose against Moses with the support of the entire assembly, and whose rebellion was only quelled by miraculous destruction. Now, if God did truly send Moses, and if his statement to Korah, Dathan and Abiram be true, viz., “The Lord sent me to do all these works, for I have not done them of mine own mind.” — (Num. 16:28) — then the putting on record such a history is intelligible. But if these things never happened, how came they to be invented? What purpose could be served by the invention? No man invents a lie without an object, and what object could there be in insulting the national character by placing in the national archives such an invention? It is impossible to conceive such a thing. The narrative bears the stamp of truth: If true, its record is explained; and in that case, God is proved, and the authenticity and reliability of the Scriptures in general. I am content with the illustration adduced, though there are many others of the same sort, and I pass to the next point of my argument.

If Moses acted as a man out of his own head as the deviser and inventor of the law, he would have taken good care to have contrived that his hand in it would always be visible, so that credit would come to him as the author of it. Instead of

that what do we find? We find him always attributing the law to God, e.g. "These are the commandments, the statutes and the judgments *which the Lord your God commanded* to teach you." — (Deut. 6:1). When expostulating with them for their rebellion, his language is, "*What are we?* Your murmurings are not against us but against the Lord." — (Deut. 16:8). In Deut. 4:20, this peculiarity comes out strongly in connection with an extraordinary instance of personal disparagement — incomprehensible on any other hypothesis but that of its truth. We find him saying: "*The Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day. Furthermore, the Lord was angry WITH ME for your sakes, and sware that I should not go over Jordan . . . but I MUST DIE IN THIS LAND.*" (Time called.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I will dispose of a matter of fact first. Mr. Roberts has said that he had Tatian, Theophilus, Mileto, Athenagoras, Barnabas, Polycarp, Ignatius and others giving evidence as to the existence of the New Testament gospels, before A.D.150. I call for the writings of Tatian, and I sit down until they are produced. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ROBERTS: I have handed the documents to the chairman.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Producing them to the chairman won't do for me. Produce me extracts from Tatian. I have them all lying before me, and not one of them says what you pretend to say they do. If the book is there, I ask that it may be put into my hands. If not, Mr. Roberts has claimed credit for what he did not possess.

Mr. ROBERTS: I never admitted I possessed the book in the sense of which you speak.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Give me the best reference you can. I don't want you to read it if you will give me the reference.

Mr. ROBERTS: I find in the case of Tatian it is the name of one of his books I rely upon as evidence of the existence of the New Testament, viz.: his *Harmony of the Four Gospels*.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Don't take up my time. Give me the books. Then I will read you what it is. I ask what I am to say to a man who pretended to put into the hands of the chairman that which he has not got. The first reference to Tatian is in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, in the 29th chapter. I ask if it is not wretched audacity for anyone to pretend that Eusebius' history is any sort of testimony whatever? Having denied that testimony, I now ask for Theophilus.

Mr. ROBERTS: I say the book is not here. There is evidence of "three books to Autolytus."

Mr. BRADLAUGH: You cannot produce it to me. The man offers to put the books in the hands of the chairman and yet they are not produced. So that the

debate is simply ended so far as concerns the evidence put into my hands. I have got it all here. I ask for the book, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROBERTS: I never said I had it.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Then the matter is disposed of so far as regards Theophilus. I ask for Mileto, and if it is not produced I won't go on with the debate.

Mr. ROBERTS: I produce evidence of Mileto having written a work, in which —

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Give me the book and I will read it.

Mr. ROBERTS: I produce the evidence upon which I founded my argument last night.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts offered to leave in the hands of the chairman the evidence upon which the argument was based, and it is not produced. I say there is nothing in Mileto capable of the construction he put upon it, and I say he has no extract capable of the construction put upon it.

Mr. ROBERTS: I said he wrote a work in which he indirectly recognises the New Testament by speaking of the Old. I gave the title of it as my argument. The shorthand writer will bear me out in what I say.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts has made an appeal to the shorthand writer. I know that there is a trustworthy gentleman* employed by Mr. Roberts' friends, and I call upon him to read from Mr. Roberts' first speech. If my memory serves me rightly, I remember that, over and over again, I challenged him to produce the authorities upon which he relied, and he at last said he would. As we are not to have Mileto, I ask for Athenagoras. I will wait for Athenagoras. Are you going to produce it?

Mr. ROBERTS: I will give you the quotation from him on which I rely.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I don't want you to occupy my time with quotations. I must decline to continue the debate if I am to be thus dealt with. I say it is the greatest pretence of evidence I ever heard in my life. I am ashamed of it.

Mr. ROBERTS: I have submitted the evidence to the Chairman.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: But evidence submitted to the Chairman I don't accept as produced evidence. Give it to me.

Mr. ROBERTS: Then I will read it.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Give it to me.

Mr. ROBERTS: I will when I have read it.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: But why can't you give it me now?

Mr. ROBERTS: I have my own reasons. I will give you the book when I have read the quotation.

*Mr. Arthur Andrew, of London.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: It is manifestly unfair that this man should take up my half-hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is in answer to your own request.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: He is going to quote from Athenagoras.

Mr. ROBERTS: I read from his petition on behalf of the Christians.—(Page 11.) He said to the Emperor, in answer to the charge of Atheism: “To convince we are not mere Atheists, hear the maxims in which we are instructed: I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father in heaven, who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.” That is a quotation from Matthew made in the middle of the second century.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Give me the book. [Mr. Roberts hands the book to Mr. Bradlaugh.] Now, friends, Mr. Roberts said he would read to you from Athenagoras to prove the existence of the gospels in the middle of the second century, and he begins by referring to his charge to the Emperor, and says the quotation is from Matthew. I say there is nothing in any writings attributable to Athenagoras that refers to Matthew at all. I say that that is an addition by a man called Brewer, and has no existence in Athenagoras at all — (A VOICE IN THE AUDIENCE: “That is only your assertion.”) — Thank you for saying that is my assertion. I have taken the trouble to become acquainted with the matter, and I am not like the man who says he is not obliged at all to produce his authorities. When you tell me a man challenges another with access to a library, he ought to be armed with the evidence itself, instead of bringing Brewer’s paltry work. Now, I ask you to hear what Murchine says, and you will judge of how much or how little Mr. Roberts knows of these things when I come to read it to you. You will find that one of the epistles he quoted to you was the epistle of Barnabas. Murchine says that, whilst, in his opinion, the epistle was the production of some Jewish writer, it was clearly a different person from Barnabas; and we find him saying just before, with reference to a number of works which bear the name of Clement:— “The epistles of Clement were falsely ascribed to that eminent father, for the purpose of securing for them great authority; and we find, during these times, various histories full of imposition and fable were composed by persons addicted to pious frauds, and were palmed upon the world.” That is the evidence of your own witness against you. Now I put to you this, and I beg you will bear your mind upon it. You have cited Ignatius, Barnabas, Hermas, Clement, and Polycarp, to prove the writings of the apostles, and my answer to that was that, so far as they were concerned, not one of the gospel authors was mentioned in one of them — not one. I read to you from Justin Martyr a statement showing that whatever documents they did quote were not the documents of our gospels. I told you last night that I was fully assured that the writings of Tatian did not exist. Why did you not come here to-night and frankly say, “It is perfectly true, they do not exist”? for you clearly ought not to have quoted that with which you were not

acquainted. It is perfectly true Mr. Roberts only relied on the name of Mileto's book; but I ask whether this is the style in which a debate of this kind should be conducted, when a speaker cannot pretend to something more than mere names. Mr. Roberts has told you, with respect to the Septuagint and Samaritan versions of the Pentateuch, that he relies on the Septuagint version, which is the only version available for the Pentateuch, the Samaritan only extending to the letter of the law and not one line beyond that. I have put this in the *Free Thinkers' Text Book*, and had come prepared for hearing the strongest things about it. Dr. Haynes says about the Septuagint, or Greek version, that it is not the original Bible, but what the interpreters have made it. Strictly speaking it appears to be the growth of at least two generations, and we might expect this from the nature of the thing. Mr. Roberts quoted Josephus as an authority for the Septuagint version, but there is no evidence, even in Josephus, as to the whole Septuagint. The express language of Josephus limits the translation to the books of the law, whatever they may mean; and therefore it is utterly impossible he could mean the whole of the Old Testament book. Mr. Roberts quotes Eusebius, whose works he calls trashy — don't forget, "trashy" — and, if trashy, he should not have produced them. You can buy the work at any library for 5s.6d. Then, as to the letters of Ignatius, if some editions of them are forgeries, the great question is, which edition is and which is not a forgery. But come, if you please, a little further, to Spinoza, who says, "of the author or authors we know almost nothing; we entertain great doubts if they were written by the persons whose names they bear." If with Mr. Roberts we are to take Josephus, then the Old Testament he referred to is clearly not the book we have to-day. Thousands of passages might be read to show that the book he refers to is not the book Mr. Roberts is here to defend; and when Mr. Roberts tells me these are mere trifling matters, I want to know where the trifles are to begin or end? I cannot understand. If Mr. Roberts had said that he relied on the New Testament to prove the Old, I could have understood him. But is there anything in the New Testament to prove the existence of the Old? There is no mention of the book, beginning with Genesis and ending with Malachi. The very Septuagint contains matters of fact which are entirely different from our Bible. I pass from this to refer to what has been said as to Paul. None of the authorities who have been quoted refer to Paul at all, though we certainly have the manufactured Christian evidences, which are the most childish authority in the world. I make no concealment of the fact that I do come prepared with authoritative evidences to support my views. If I were not I should not be fit to take part in a debate of this kind. I may now refer you to Lord Amberley's new book. p.254. I am not reading this as evidence. I am reading an expression of opinion from a book in which I find every research. [Here Mr. Bradlaugh read an extract from Lord Amberley's new work, which the shorthand writer has not supplied.]

Let us look at some more of the internal evidence. We have a statement that, before the baptism, John knew Jesus, and thought himself unworthy to baptise him, and we have a statement that he did not know him before, but knew him on

the announcement, "This is my beloved Son". We have Matthew 11:2, 3, and Luke 7:19. John sending to enquire whether Jesus was the Christ or not? We should think if John heard the declaration, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased", he would not have thought it necessary to send messengers to ascertain whether Jesus was the Christ or not. And what answer did Jesus give? He does not remind John of the scene at the baptism, but he says, "Go and tell John you have seen me performing miracles, that the blind see, the lame walk, the leper is cleansed." I submit that one of these two statements is untrue, and that the entire part of the book which contains them cannot be otherwise. I would refer to the miracle of the loaves and fishes, where Jesus fed five thousand with five loaves and two small fishes; and I would refer to the worthy disciples, and to their forgetfulness of the miracles afterwards. In either case an authentic revelation of God would not be made in so ridiculous a fashion. Take the case of the miracle which is recited in three different ways in three of the evangelists — I mean the miracle of casting out the devils. Was it one man or two men? Was there one devil or two? or a legion? Is the story true or untrue, or is it divine revelation at all? If you took any other book with so many contradictions in so many pages you would resign or reject it. I come now to the alleged cursing of the fig tree. We are told that Jesus came to the fig tree, when the season was not in, and cursed it, because it had no fruit, which it could not have, not being the season. I ask, is that an authentic revelation? And take that declaration of Christ which is most important according to you — I mean the death and resurrection of Jesus. Take the gospels of Matthew and Mark; the last recorded words of Jesus, according to Matthew and to Mark, are, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani". If Jesus deemed God had forsaken him, when his death was to save the world, and he had so little confidence as to cry, in the bitterness of despair, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" am I to be condemned because I cannot see such a thing divine? Is not this the language of an enthusiast who had deluded others, and a man who was himself deluded? It is not certainly the language of a man who believed in the truth of his mission, which was to redeem the world. I refer you again to Matt. 2:5, 6, where there is a pretended quotation from Micah 5:2, making Bethlehem the place of the advent of the governor that shall rule my people Israel. This made Hosea (11:1) deliberately untrue, for it was there said, "Out of Egypt have I called my son". My time is gone, and gone in such a way with nothing to answer that I need not regret it.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say, in my position of referee on points of order, I should not consider myself as referee on a subject like that submitted by Mr. Roberts, unless at the request of both parties. If, when the discussion is fully over, the gentlemen choose to refer any point to me I will have no objection, as far as I am concerned, but nothing but a mutual request would induce me to act in this way. Mr. Roberts will now occupy a quarter of an hour, either by a speech or by questioning Mr. Bradlaugh, who will answer categorically.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. BRADLAUGH.

Mr. Bradlaugh, do you believe that the Jews are an ancient nation? — I believe they were an ancient race.

Do you believe they have always accepted Moses as the writer of the works bearing his name? — I don't think I have very clear evidence on the point. Some time ago an eminent Jew wrote a letter, and he gives a statement of the arguments used by the Rabbis themselves against it.

Do you know that these writings have been all along attributed by that race to Moses? — I believe there were writings current amongst the Jews which the popular voice attributed to different people. I am not able to fix that popular voice. From the Bible I learn that the law was lost and found suddenly. From outside writings I learn that during the captivity they lost all their books.

Have the Jews always regarded Moses as their principal leader? — I should think not, so far as I am able to judge.

Have you any good reason to think otherwise? — The question of Moses' existence, like that of Buddha and Zoroaster, is very mythical.

Then you doubt whether Moses was their leader in the beginning of their history? — The whole of the alleged exodus is so very doubtful, I can find nothing to verify it.

Can you verify a myth from records of an historic character? — Yes in the case of the Buddhists, I have carefully worked out the system, and the remark equally applies to Zoroaster. In every case there has been some person semi-miraculous, or who is believed to be miraculous.

Do you admit there was an historic beginning in all cases? — I don't.

Do you think there was any historic beginning to the career of Moses? — I don't. The whole of the story is so monstrous that it looks as if the name itself was mythic.

What part of the account given of Moses is monstrous? — I will tell you: "the killing of all the cattle by a storm".

Do you mean to say it is monstrous and abstractly impossible for a storm to result in the killing of cattle? — I do, if the cattle were dead already. I will read it from the book. Do you ask for the proof of what I have said?

I did not ask for it. Do you consider that all miracles are impossible? — Yes, especially the killing of cattle twice over.

Why do you say they are impossible? — You have asked me if I believed them. I don't believe them to be possible because my definition of a miracle is: that which

never happened in the past, don't happen in the present, and won't happen in the future.

Is that not a begging of the question? — No. Logically, the word miracle to me is without meaning. In Scripture the word miracle is used to denote events which experience gives no record of their possibility of execution.

Are we to make our experience the measure of the possible? — I mean to make experience the measure of my possibility.

Do you mean to say you only believe in what you have seen? — I never said anything so intolerably stupid.

What do you mean, then, by forming a judgment of the possible on the basis of experience? — I don't limit experience by my own experience only. I mean the recorded experience of other men too.

Then you will admit the experience of others as a basis of belief in things you have not yourself experienced? — I have said so.

Why do you not admit the experience of the apostles in the matter of the resurrection of Christ? — I have already early in this debate admitted that evidence that applies directly to ordinary occurrences, and can be judged of by ordinary experience, cannot be so judged when it applies to extraordinary occurrences.

Then in the case of extraordinary occurrences, you would not be governed by what you have called "the best experience of the best men"? — If you appeal to me I must be allowed to be judge on such matters myself.

In such matters, you would not be guided by the experience of others? — Not if inconsistent with the operation of the senses.

You would not believe what others have seen unless you considered it possible? — I don't say that.

Then I ask you why you refuse to accept the testimony of the apostles who testified the performance of miracles, and evidenced the sincerity of their testimony in so many ways? — Just on the same principle that I should not believe that Mr. Bradlaugh turned three somersaults on the platform, and then stood on his head in the course of the discussion last night, because it is unreasonable.

Do you say it is unreasonable for a man to rise from the dead? — Yes. Because the word life means organic function, and if he died and re-appeared, it would then be a new life.

Upon what philosophic ground do you hold it is impossible for a man that had once lived to be put together again? — I did not say once lived; I said a man that once died.

Of course; my question implies that. I ask on what ground you deny the possibility of a man who has once lived and died being re-organised and made to

live again? — It is beyond the range of my experience, and I have no evidence that it is within the experience of other men.

Is it not possible that such a thing might occur without coming within the range of your experience or that of other men? — I don't know.

Do you admit that, many ages ago, there were no human beings on the globe? — I have reason to believe that, some millions of years ago, there was not a human being upon earth.

Would not your principle lead you, had you been alive then, to say it was impossible human beings could ever appear on earth? — Not being alive then, I cannot see how I could have formed an opinion one way or the other. I don't imagine a time when nobody lived.

Well, I will put it retrospectively. Would not your rule of belief lead to this conclusion, that at the same time no human being had as yet appeared upon earth, it was an impossibility that they ever could appear, because it was not within the experience of any living being upon earth? — It is not for me to say what might have been; I deal with experience, and here we are.

And may it not yet be a matter of experience that men will rise from the dead? — There are no known laws in the universe to warrant the idea.

Do you mean to say that your knowledge of the universe is sufficient to enable you to say that there may not be a latent power somewhere equal to the reproduction of dead men? — We don't know everything, of course.

MR. BRADLAUGH QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

Will you kindly tell me whether you think a book could be Divine revelation which provided that a man might steal a woman, rob her of her virtue, and then turn her out in the world without any sort of recompense? — I decline to answer the question in that form.

Do you know that Deut. 21:11-14, does preach that? — No, it does not.

I will read it to you: "When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife, then shalt thou bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month; and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife; and it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for

money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.” Don’t that say exactly what I say? — No.

Do you hold that to be divine revelation which provides that a man may buy a servant, keep him for seven years, and if he cannot buy himself off at the end of that time, to bore his ear with an awl. Do you hold that to be divine revelation? — Yes.

Do you hold it to be a divine revelation that of people who are not of the Jewish race, the Jews may buy bondmen and bondwomen, and take them as an inheritance and have them in possession for ever? — Yes.

Do you hold it to be divine revelation that a man might beat his slave, and if that his slave live for three days after the beating, then the master shall escape his punishment? — I object to the term “slave” with its modern associations.

Then I will substitute “servant”. May a man buy a servant and beat him, and if the servant does not die in two days the master shall escape punishment? — The law of Moses provided that, and I believe the law of Moses to be divine.

Do you believe that David never did anything that was wrong? — No I do not believe that.

Do you think that the text which says that he always did that which was right in God’s eyes is divine revelation? — Allow me to read it to you. That is said with qualification.

What are you going to read? — 1 Kings 15:5. “David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, *save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite.*”

But it says in 14:8; “Yet thou hast not been as my servant David, who kept my commandments, and who followed me with all his heart to do that only which was right in mine eyes.” — Yes, that is correct

Do you think it is true? — I do.

Do you think it is true that David did keep all God’s commandments and follow Him with all his heart? — Yes, with the exception mentioned in the 8th verse.

I ask you whether in the 14th of 1st of Kings, and 8th verse, there is any exception made? — No.

Then is the 8th verse true or not? — It is true of the general tenor of David’s life.

Was David a liar? — David sometimes said that which was not true.

Was he a murderer? — No, except in the case in question.

In how many cases within a few hundred had David murdered? — Only in the one case of Uriah the Hittite.

Did not David murder many others? — There was a great difference in those cases. To kill is not to murder, if God commands.

Was not David a thief? — No.

Did he not take property which did not belong to him? — In a certain sense, yes; in a certain sense, no. I can explain the difference if you will allow me.

Then with these slight exceptions David did keep all God's commandments — murdering, stealing, lying and adultery — this being the description of a man after God's own heart? Is stealing a wife, while her husband is fighting for the thief, good or bad? — Bad.

Is murdering men good or bad? — Bad.

Is stealing property good or bad? — Bad.

Did David do all that? No.

Do you mean to say that when he was sheltered by the king of Gath he did not commit murder and robbery? — I mean to say that the law of God in the case in question authorised what David did, and, therefore, it was neither murder nor robbery.

Will you kindly tell me who authorised David to kill the subjects of the king by whom he was sheltered? — There was a general law under which Israel took possession of Canaan, and that was that nothing should be left alive. The Canaanitish nations were sunk in wickedness, and God had given them over to destruction.

Do you think God sanctioned men seeking shelter and protection from people they meant to exterminate? — As they were only in the position of savages or animals, the action was not of the character you impute to it.

Then the killing of savages is not in your judgment immoral? — Not if commanded by God.

Do you think there could be a divine revelation which commanded people to kill other people against whom they had no cause of offence? — They had offended against God.

Do you think there could be a divine revelation which enjoined any people to kill all the males of the nation and all women who were mothers or wives? — I do.

Do you think there could be a divine revelation which alleges that when mercy was shown, God was angry with the merciful? — Give me the case you refer to.

Do you think there is such a case as that? — I decline to answer the question in that form.

Do you mean to deny that, more than once, there were cases in which the Jews spared the people they went against, and God's displeasure was kindled against them? — I admit there are such cases.

You admit they destroyed people they had no quarrel against? — Yes.

And you think that is good? — Yes, under the circumstances.

Should you think it good for to-day? — If God commanded me I would do it.

You had better take care whom you try it on! — No fear; If God gives me a commission, I shall be able to execute it.

Don't you hold that under any circumstances war by a people against another with whom they have no cause of quarrel, is monstrous, cruel, and merciless? — If God has not commanded it, Yes.

Do you think God's commands can make a bad thing a good thing? — No.

Yet you deem all God's commandments good? — There is a difference between God and man as to what is good and what is bad. God has a right to do with his own property as he likes.

You hold that God may make a man good by torturing him? — I had not that thought.—(Time called.)

The CHAIRMAN: It is becoming necessary that I must ask you to maintain better order. That is to say, to do justice to the speakers, let them have the argument between themselves. You can judge, moreover, when you have the printed discussion if there has been any mistake. I am speaking to the few who occasionally interrupt. I judge the body of the meeting will be on my side during the remaining hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: You will have observed that Mr. Bradlaugh has not attempted to discuss the case of Moses from its internal peculiarities, upon which hangs a very powerful argument. I will not follow him in his remarks on what are called the Apostolic Fathers, because I do not attach any particular importance to them. I cited them merely because Mr. Bradlaugh took the unreasonable position of denying that there was evidence of the existence of the New Testament prior to A.D.150. And now I have produced the evidence, he tries to make light of it. Mr. Bradlaugh's attempt to disprove the Bible has been to rehearse alleged difficulties and discrepancies, some of which, in cross-examination, I have endeavoured to explain. He has gone into the same course every night. He might have gone into the contradictions in the way the Socratic method allows, but he has not done so. He dwelt on them in long speeches; perhaps because he knew their force would disappear under the Socratic treatment, while they seem to show for something in a speech. Well, I will now notice some of them. I do so with reluctance, and only lest a false impression might remain if I were to ignore them, and at once resume the threat of my discourse about Moses. I take up, first the alleged discrepancy between the 24th of Luke and the 1st of the Acts on the question of the forty days.

Acts 1, states that Christ was seen for forty days after his resurrection, and that his disciples, during that time, tested his reality by many infallible proofs. Mr. Bradlaugh says this is inconsistent with Luke 24. There is nothing whatever in the objection; for though the 1st of the Acts certainly specifies forty days, Luke mentions no time at all. Where can there be a contradiction in such a case? Remember that Luke is the writer of the Acts as well as of the gospel; and the fact that he mentions forty days in the Acts as the length of time Christ spent with his disciples is to be taken as a supplement in the one case of an omission in the other. Perhaps Mr. Bradlaugh may have something to say in reply to that. He did not develop his objection with the distinctness necessary to enable me to be more particular. I fancy the suggestion is that the whole of the 24th of Luke, including Christ's ascension, is crowded into one day, and that, according to Luke, Christ ascended on the day of his resurrection; but there is nothing to shew this. It was simply stated that he did this and that, without telling us of the time at all. The writer of the Acts of the Apostles tells us the time he lingered in the midst of the apostles, giving them proofs that they were dealing with a real person.

Then Mr. Bradlaugh says that to Abraham God made a promise which he has not fulfilled. If he had stopped there, he would have been within the bounds of truth. But when he argued that, because it is not fulfilled, therefore it will not be, he was illogical. It would not be difficult to show that it is the teaching of the New Testament that the promise will be fulfilled. But Mr. Bradlaugh said it never could be because there has been a gap, and that there can be no gap in "ever". It depends upon when "ever" begins. In this case the expression "for ever" goes back to the time of promise. It begins with the time of performance. There is evidence that Abraham himself recognised this. In Gen. 15 we read that this was addressed to him:—"And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." That shows the promise was not to take immediate effect. A promise does not involve immediate possession. If an interval elapses, and the promise has not been recalled, that is no reason for concluding the promise will never be fulfilled. We are expressly told in Hebrews 11:13, "These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but having SEEN THEM AFAR OFF." Faith, of which Abraham was the type, is defined by Paul to be "believing in the promises of God". This of itself involves the conclusion that the promise to Abraham was not to be fulfilled at that time. The Bible affirms that Abraham has not received the promise, and yet Mr. Bradlaugh makes use of the fact that he has not received the promise as a proof that the Bible is telling lies. Extraordinary argument! which requires no further notice. The proof is entirely the other way. I am sorry Mr. Bradlaugh is sacrificing good time by forcing these trifles on my notice. He asks me to decide whether there were one, two, three, or more women at the sepulchre on the morning of Christ's resurrection. My answer is very brief. There was one, two, and three and more. When two or more narratives are proved to be true, they must be in harmony in their details, though they are apparently discrepant, and

this discrepancy is a proof that the gospel is not a forgery; if it had been a forgery, the Four Gospels would have been made to tally precisely. Whereas, like all cases of true witnesses, three or four men speak to the same facts, but vary in their narrative of them, though consistent when all put together. I put them together in the following manner:—

The first fact to be noted is that there were a number of women, related to the transactions of the resurrection morning. We find (Matt. 27:55; Mark 15:40-41) that “many women” had followed Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem, “among whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee’s children.” These many women were witnesses of the crucifixion (*ibid*), and also of the deposit of the body of Christ in the tomb of Joseph (Luke 23:55, also Mark 15:47); after which they returned and prepared sweet spices and ointments, and rested on the Sabbath (Luke 23:56), having arranged for an early visit to the sepulchre on the first day morning to embalm — (Mark 16:1). In the early visit, most of the “many women” appear to have taken part (Luke 24:1), and at first in one band. The order of events seems to be this:

1.—Before the arrival of the women, there had been an earthquake and angelic manifestation attendant on the resurrection of Jesus, throwing the keepers of the tomb into a panic.—(Matt. 28:2.)

2.—The women, who had wondered how they were to obtain access to the tomb, arrive and find the stone rolled to one side, and the sepulchre empty. They conclude the body had been taken away, and are perplexed.—(Luke 24:4.)

3.—Mary Magdalene, leaving the other women at the sepulchre in their perplexity, returns and tells Peter (Jno. 20:2), saying, “They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.”

4.—In Mary’s absence, two angels appear at the sepulchre, in whose presence the remaining women stoop, affrighted, to the earth. The angels inform the women of the resurrection of Christ, and tell them to go and tell his disciples. They depart quickly with fear and great joy, and run to bring the disciples word.—(Matt. 28:8.)

5.—Mary returns with Peter and John, who inspect the empty sepulchre, and see the left clothes of the dead. Not knowing the Scriptures that Jesus should rise again from the dead, sorrowing curiosity satisfied, they go away again to their own home.—(John 20:2-10.)

6.—Mary remains behind, and stands outside the sepulchre weeping. In a short time she takes another look into the sepulchre, and this time she sees the angels who had some time before appeared to the rest of the women. She does not know them to be angels, but probably supposes them to be visitors. They ask her why she weeps. She says, “Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.” Having said this, she steps back to resume her position outside the sepulchre, and sees a third person, whom she supposes to be the

gardener. She instantly asks him where he has laid the body of Jesus. The response reveals to her the delightful fact that it was Jesus himself. Forbidding her to touch him, he tells her to go and tell his disciples that he is about to ascend. The interview terminated, Mary departs.—(John 20:11-17.)

7.—The other women, yet on their way, having been angelically apprised of the resurrection, are met by Jesus, who salutes them, and tells them to go and ask his brethren to meet him in Galilee. They hold him by the feet and worship him. There is no interdiction against touching him, as in the case of Mary, the cause being removed.—(Matt. 28:9-10.)

8.—Mary Magdalene arrives at the place of the disciples' stay, about the same time as "Joanna and Mary, the mother of James, and the other women that were with them."—(Luke 24:10.)

9.—The women (all of them) tell what had happened; but their words seem to the apostles as idle tales.

10.—Two of their company afterwards (during the day) go on some business to Emmaus; and while on the way, are joined by the Lord, who converses with them, but holds their eyes, and reveals himself to them at the end of the journey and then disappears.—(Luke 24:13-31.)

11.—Peter, being out by himself, is also visited by the Lord, and returns and declares the fact to the assembled disciples, who begin to believe it must be true.—(Luke 24:33-34.)

12.—The two from Emmaus return and narrate their experience.

13.—While they are discussing the matter, Jesus himself appears, shows the nail marks on his hands and feet, submits to be handled, and eats before them in their midst, Thomas being absent.

14.—Thomas returns after the interview, but refuses to believe what he is told, unless he sees Christ for himself, and is allowed to put his fingers in the holes of the nails and spear.

15.—Eight days afterwards, the disciples being again assembled, and Thomas being with them, Jesus again appears in their midst, and addresses himself specially to Thomas, whose scepticism disappears before the evidence.

16.—Afterwards the disciples return to Galilee, where Christ appears to them several times, and finally at the end of forty days, the disciples having returned to Jerusalem, he takes leave of them at Bethany.—(Time called.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts says that I did not make my objection about Luke and the forty days of the Acts quite clear. I will try to do so now. I say the whole of the events following the resurrection are limited to one day by the 24th

chapter of Luke. You will find the story as distinct as possible. First, the journey from Emmaus: they “rose up the same hour” and returned to Jerusalem, where they found the eleven gathered together; then Christ appears, and after talking to them, he led them out to Bethany. If that don’t mean one day, language is not of much use. That is corroborated by Mark 16, which says that, when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared unto two of them, and afterwards to the eleven. “So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.” I say this chapter leaves no room for forty days. Then, as to the women, I say the discrepancy is equally proved. Mr. Roberts says, that if forged, there would have been no discrepancy. I never said the gospels were forged. I say, like the mythic books of all religion, they have germs of historic fact, with the gradual addition of traditions. We may admit that, as ordinary men telling a story they believe, they vary, but we ought not to be damned or saved for our belief or non-belief of that story. In the case of two reporters, one might leave out some words, and another might misunderstand others, and then some discrepancies might be expected; but in a narrative divinely commissioned by God to give the exact truth, we should not expect that sort of thing. Matthew gives two women — the two Marys; Mark mentions two Marys and Salome; Luke named Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, “and other women that were with them”; and John only specifies Mary Magdalene. Mr. Roberts says all this is true; to use his own phrase, it is a real discrepancy on the surface, but that the discrepancy may be explained away. I must say that Mr. Roberts has a very different notion as to what is good evidence from myself; and I put my notions to you very strongly. When as to David, he says that, with the exception of the affair with Uriah the Hittite, David never did anything that was not good. I cannot help reminding him of what is recorded in Samuel 27. I find that David went to Achish, king of Gath, for shelter. “And David said unto Achish, if I have now found grace in thine eyes let them give me a place in some town in the country that I may dwell there: for why should thy servant dwell in the royal city with thee? Then Achish gave him Ziklag; wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto the kings of Judah unto this day.” In return for this, David smote the land and left neither man nor woman alive, and took away the sheep and the oxen, and the asses, and the camels, and the apparel, and returned to Achish. David saved neither man nor woman alive to bring tidings to Gath. I say that was the conduct of an ungrateful scoundrel, who knew he was doing wrong. He was a traitorous thief, who murdered the people and stole their cattle. If that is religion, save me from that religion. Then we come to another case. Mr. Roberts don’t think that David robbed. In 1 Samuel 25, two chapters before the one I have read from, we find that David asked Nabal to give things to him, the only justification being that he had not already taken them; and when Nabal in strong language said he would not do it, David prepared himself to take them by force, but Nabal’s wife met him and he took her. Mr. Roberts said that David committed no offence except in the case of Uriah the Hittite, and that these people

were savages. I don't wonder at the mischief done in Patagonia or Terra del Feugo of old. Why should they be killed because they are savages? Were they consulted by the God of high heaven before He made them? With such savage doctrines, such inhuman and damnable doctrines, instead of being an Atheist as I am, I would be an Anti-theist, if I thought it would avail — (A VOICE: "Shut up".) That is just what I am doing with your Bible. In the 9th of Exodus, you will find that all the cattle of Egypt died, and you will find, in the 19th verse, a caution was sent to those who believed, in order that they might escape with their cattle, so that they should not die; and we find that those that left their cattle in the field, discovered that they had become victims in the storm, although they had already been killed in the 6th verse. Mr. Roberts says that the promise of the land to Abraham is misunderstood by Mr. Bradlaugh. Of course, if you have a 5 note given to you, and have ten thousand promised to you that you shall have them for ever, and you never receive one of them, that is a promise, and it is broken. That is the case of Abraham. The words I have read to you: "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward, and eastward and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever." He never did give it. Mr. Roberts says, "But he will when Christ comes; and, therefore, pray Mr. Bradlaugh, what will you say to Christ then?" I don't know. We shall see. Wait till it happens. Then Mr. Roberts says that the texts about cruelty are not capable of the construction I put upon them, because these people may have been ordered to be punished. I draw attention to Deut. 20:10: "When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it." If the nation will make peace, they shall all be slaves; but if they won't, "but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it; and when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword; but the women, and the little ones and the cattle, and all that is in the city shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies which the Lord thy God hath given thee." I ask if that is not a horrible and terrible doctrine? I ask how can that be divine revelation which is so full of cruelty? I ask whether it is not savage? This was the language which justified negro slavery, and still supports the Coolie trade. It is said these slaves are inferior beings — "savages". Why, that is language which might have been uttered in some far-off corner of the globe? I never expected to hear it in Birmingham. I hold slavery is a damnable cruelty everywhere; but where we have the stronger intellect against the savage, it is ten times more cruel. How, then, shall we further proceed? Shall I follow Moses when conjuring with the magicians? Is that an authentic revelation from God which brought up the wicked frogs from the waters of Egypt to spread over the land? Is this believed which says that there was darkness over all the land of Egypt, but there was light in the dwellings of the children of Israel, though they might be living in the same house or be immediate neighbours, there being thus for the time light and dark, patchwork fashion? Follow Moses through his zig-zag journey, during which the clothes of the people

were not to wear out? Imagine, a Jewish baby two months old on leaving Egypt arriving at Palestine in the same clothes 40 years after! Follow Moses, when in the war between the Amalekites and the Jews, he, like some Duke of Cambridge, seeks a place of safety while the battle goes on. Shall I follow him while the drooping hands are being held up until the Amalekites are beaten? Shall I follow him through the absurdities of the quails and the manna? Shall I follow him up the Mount where God says to him, "Let me alone that my wrath may wax hot against them, that I may consume them?" Shall I follow him where he persuades God that he is wrong, and repenteth him of the evil which he thought to do to the people? Follow Moses! I have followed him a step too far. Is this Bible an authentic revelation, or is it a record of a hundred different myths linked together from the minds of a thousand different men? I have never, from the first speech I made in this debate, said that this is the work of forgers; and no man, no honest man, would keep me to that which I don't advance.

Mr. ROBERTS: There are always two ways of looking at every case, and he pursues the best course who puts all the facts together harmoniously. I daresay I might appeal to the experience of every one as to mystery hanging over some particular incident, till one fact is ascertained which throws all the rest into beautiful harmony. So it is in this matter. Many things appear jumbled and inconsistent if they are looked at apart from the central fact. I don't wonder that Mr. Bradlaugh does not understand the Bible because he ignores its backbone, so to speak. As I said in my opening address, take God from the Bible and you take reason and all that is intelligible away from it, and lay it open to all the harsh unfriendly sayings in which Mr. Bradlaugh indulges as to its principles, its ordinances, and its history. Recognise the book as it stands in its completeness and it appears in a totally different aspect. In fact its divinity appears from itself. This will be seen if you try to apply to it Mr. Bradlaugh's hypothesis of its character. Mr. Bradlaugh's judgment of the book is that it is a human production. Now if that judgment of it be right, then its internal peculiarities ought to agree with it. We ought on such a theory of it to see human principles at work, the same as in everything else of human evolution. My argument is that there are facts in the case that defy explanation upon any human principles. I have rehearsed some of them. I show that some phases of the recorded attitude of Moses cannot be explained unless we accept the theory of his divine mission. On Moses, then, I propose to retain your attention during the short time at my disposal. It might please Mr. Bradlaugh better if I were to follow the assertions he has made this evening, but I must do my duty. I am here to affirm the truth of the Bible. To prove this affirmation requires argument and I would be precluded from entering upon this argument were I to do as Mr. Bradlaugh wishes, for it would take all the time at my disposal. But there is a way out of the dilemma. If Mr. Bradlaugh will affirm that the Bible is a myth, a human production, or undivine I will agree, as I have

already said, to meet him for a similar period to this discussion, and it would then be my duty to follow him in all points and particulars, and to show that none of them were inconsistent with the fact that the book consists of reliable and authentic records of the proceedings of God in human affairs. Mr. Bradlaugh referred as a matter of animadversion to the fact that Moses took the Israelites into a sterile part of the world. This is one of those points that, in my judgment, tell in support of the professions of the Bible; for such a proceeding is unintelligible, if Moses was not directed to do it by God, who had power to sustain them there. If God directed him to do it, the proceeding is a perfectly rational one. But if Moses acted out of his own head, what possible explanation could be given of his taking the people into a region where it was impossible they could obtain sustenance? Manna was given. That Mr. Bradlaugh treated as an invention. Upon that I have to say that, if the manna had been an invention, something better would have been invented than that. For what are the facts concerning this manna? That the people murmured about it; that they chode with Moses; they recalled to mind the leeks and garlicks of Egypt, and wished themselves back again. The fact of their murmuring is recorded; and if the murmuring occurred, it is a proof the manna was given, and that God was working with Moses; for Moses could not bring down manna to feed so large an assembly. If the murmuring did not occur, what conceivable object could the inventor of the story have had in inventing the murmuring? It may be asked, why did not God provide the children of Israel with something better than manna? Why not roast beef and plum-pudding and wine? which certainly would have been the sort of thing invented if the story of Exodus was a Jewish invention for the glorification of the nation. They would then certainly have been represented as having received in the wilderness a plentiful supply of first-class articles. Instead of that, here is an article which the people did not relish and soon got tired of. What was the reason for feeding the people on this peculiar kind of food? Mark the reason! Deut. 8:16:— “Who (God) fed thee in the wilderness with manna, which thy fathers knew not, *that He might humble thee*, and that He might prove thee, to do thee good at thy latter end.” You will judge for yourselves whether it is possible to admit that this could have been an invention. Invention is always for a purpose, and that purpose the glorification of the people concerned. In this case, no such purpose is served, but the contrary. The theory of invention has no reasonable standing ground; while, on the other hand, if it is not invention, but a record of what actually occurred, the occurrence and the record of it have a reasonable explanation, and in that case the divinity of the Bible is proved. Just listen to the context, and imagine whether the language is possibly that of an inventor, or a man seeking to use the Jews for his own glorification: “When thou hast eaten and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which He hath given thee. Beware that thou forget the Lord thy God in not keeping His commandments and His judgments and His statutes which I command thee this day. Lest when thou hast eaten and art full and hast built goodly houses and hast

dwelt therein, and when thy herds and thy flocks multiply and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied, then thy heart be lifted up and thou forget the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage." You see Moses never takes the credit of the Egyptian deliverance to himself.—(Time called.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: The remark has been made that if we take this book as a human production we cannot understand it. How useful that is. We have no other books of a similar character to which similar objections apply? Have we Lord Amberley's new book, in which he has two sub-divisions, one of which he applies to holy persons and the other to holy books:

"Under the title 'Holy Persons', we have Confucius or Khung-fu-tsze, the founder of Confucianism; Lao-tse, the founder of Taouism; Sakyamuni or Guatama Bhudda, the founder of Buddhism; Zarathustra or Zoroaster, the founder of Parseeism; Mahommed or Mahomet, the founder of Islamism."

Each of these has religious books, some more and some less ancient than ours, to which similar objections do apply. Then Mr. Roberts says, "I won't answer Mr. Bradlaugh's objections to the Bible now, because that is not now my business. I will do it in another discussion." Why, during three nights, we have diminished considerably as regards the number of the audience; and if we continue to diminish till the sixth night, there will be nobody left but the disputants and their committee. I am not so foolish as to incur a second infliction of this sort if I can help it. I accepted Mr. Robert's challenge in this case because I knew he was regarded as a fair representative man of a body of religionists whom I had heard well spoken of here and in America. I have met with strong men and weak men among them, but all I believe reasonable and respectable men; but, as regards Mr. Roberts, I have done my whole duty in accepting this challenge. If Mr. Roberts has the victory, I shall be quite content, and if he thinks I am unwise enough to submit to another six nights, all I can say is he don't know me as well as I know myself. But I will tell you what I will do. If he can get half-a-dozen clergymen of the Church of England or ministers of other bodies to back him as their representative, then I am bound to meet him in a second debate; but I have accepted now his challenge, and my reason for not accepting a second is that I don't think he is competent to treat the subject he has undertaken to treat. I don't think it would be doing justice to Christians to do it. And I will tell you why. I would not willingly have chosen a weak man, when I might have had a stronger man. I do not, therefore, fear; for I have occupied too many years upon the platform to be afraid. I call a weak man a man who pretends to quote works he is unacquainted with. You here, to-night, who have listened so far, especially ladies, will bear with me for a moment. I have not chosen to consider when I have been speaking to believers or unbelievers, but I have an extract from *A String of Pearls*,

collected and strung together by my friend Mr. C.C. Cattell:—"A believer is one who takes for granted anything, sense or nonsense; while he who examines for himself into the truth or falsehood of any statement, and has the courage to avow his conclusion, is by the ignorant and prejudiced, designated an infidel. Such were, in their time, the great reformers, the philosophers, and the best men of past times, who were severely persecuted; as Aristotle, Descartes, Socrates, Virgilius, Trithemisis, Pythagoras, and others" — (A VOICE: "Has he got his portrait in the book?") Yes, and if yours had been beside it, it would have been the portrait of an indecent donkey who could not keep quiet. What I wanted to point out to you when that indecent interruption took place was that, if it be true that I shall suffer so severe a penalty as has been foreshadowed at some future time at the coming of Christ, the more reason you have for bearing with me and try to convince me and convert me now — the more reason because it is not alone for myself. You think my denials deserve a penalty, but there are thousands whom my voice influences — thousands of young men whom my voice is influencing. You may think I am not in earnest, but where is the inducement to be an infidel? An outlaw in early life from my country for my opinions, it is enough that they have stopped my way in many a walk in life. Say what you will, you will not deny me some powers of speech; you won't deny me the acquaintance necessary to deal with these subjects. If a desire to improve my home later in my life should draw me from public view to make my means of life, my advocacy would still continue amongst those with whom I lived. I find the whole of the religion of the world centred against myself, and those young men around me. You won't destroy my influence with hisses and such like demonstrations. You can only do so by meeting us man for man and woman for woman, and in the spirit of your book try and convert us, but not by taking up the first stone to smite us to the earth.

Sixth Night,
THURSDAY, 22nd JUNE, 1876,
IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM.

THE CHAIR WAS OCCUPIED BY MR. GEORGE H. ST. CLAIR.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, this being the last night of the debate, time is of more consequence. I trust it is not necessary to make a single remark, and I shall sit down at once, asking Mr. Roberts to commence on the affirmative side as usual.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, on this, the last night of the debate, it is my duty to submit to you the strongest of the arguments which I have to bring forward in substantiation of the proposition that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation. My contention to-night is that the prophecies of the Bible — so explicit, so sober, and so useful in their character, being in these respects so unlike the vague, incoherent, irrational predictions of the Greek augurs and other contemporary pretenders, are an evidence of the divinity of the authorship of the Bible — evidence which becomes simply overwhelming when we consider their fulfilment in the accomplished history of mankind. That you will perceive is a very large subject, but I shall have to treat it in a very small way on account of limited time.

If there is one feature more characteristic of the Bible than another, it is the peculiarity of prophecy — the foretelling of coming events. It runs — I will not say as a golden thread or vein, but rather as a broad belt or seam of precious metal — throughout the book, beginning at the very beginning, and only ending at the last chapter of Revelation. Genesis 3, for example, contains a comprehensive prediction of human redemption, “That the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head”, and that at last the seed of the woman shall triumph, into which in detail I do not now enter, having more palpable matter in hand. I will not enter minutely into the history of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whose history is replete with the element of prophecy; nor into the history of Israel, of which the same may be said. I will bring before you those prophecies which, both for their extensiveness and frequency, and the remarkable manner in which they have been fulfilled, are visible to the eyes of all the nations of the earth. I refer first to the predictions which have been realised in the history of the Jewish nation.

Mr. Bradlaugh's notions on the subject are somewhat indefinite, but he was bound to admit last night that the Jews were an ancient race, going back at least 3,000 years, and that they have, all that time, had documents which they have regarded as those of Moses, and which they have all that time regarded as divine. I shall quote from those documents, because their reception for so long a period is a proof that they are so entitled to be received. As I have said, the predictions are so frequent and extensive that I shall have to be content with a mere selection, at the same time premising that they are but a sample or two of hundreds.

We have in the 26th chapter of Leviticus, the 31st to the 36th verses, a statement which I will now read: "I will make your cities waste, and bring your sanctuaries into desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours. And I will bring the land into desolation: and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it. And I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you: and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste. Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye *be* in your enemies' land; *even* then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths. As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest; because it did not rest in your sabbaths when ye dwelt upon it. And upon them that are left *alive* of you I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as fleeing from a sword; and they shall fall when none pursueth". I call attention to a similar statement in the book of Deuteronomy by the same speaker. In Deut. 28:49, 50, 61, we read: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old nor show favour to the young . . . Also every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee until thou be destroyed". I should like to read other illustrations of the same thing, but I must be content to refer to one specimen from each of the prophets: Isaiah 6:11-12; Jer. 5:15-20; Ezek. 5:5-17; Dan. 12:7; Hosea 9:17; Joel 1:1-6; Amos. 8:12; Micah 5-16; Zeph. 1:12-18, &c. &c.. I add to the list the prediction of Christ himself, who spoke upon the same subject in the following terms. In Luke 21:24, he was foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, and the calamities which should befall the Jewish nation, and at verse 24 he says: "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." As a comment upon all these predictions, I simply point to the fact of the desolation of Jerusalem under the foot of the Gentiles for eighteen centuries, and the dispersion of the Jews among all the civilised nations under heaven. Here is the prophecy: there is its fulfilment. Can it be possible for prophecies to be fulfilled more completely than these? The Jews are the most valuable witnesses of the Bible's truth. Mr. Bradlaugh did not quite comprehend my argument as to their continuous existence being involved in the question of the truth of the Bible, and I will make the argument plainer now, since in itself it

involves the fulfilment of prophecy in the most specific manner. The simple prophecy that the Jew would remain in all nations until a certain time, "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled", would alone require, if true, that the Jews must be in existence at the present time. But I will make the argument more manifest than that. In Jeremiah 30:11, we read: "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will *I not make a full end of thee*; but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished." Again, Amos 9:8:—"Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saying that *I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob*, saith the Lord." In Deut. 32:26, we have a memorial song — a prophetic song: prophetic of Israel's future experiences, which Moses committed to the custody of Joshua, the son of Nun; a very remarkable composition, certainly, if it was the production of a patriot who wished to ingratiate himself with the people. It is worthy to be read through; but I must confine myself to an extract, as bearing on the point in view:—"I said I would scatter them into corners; I would make the remembrance of them to cease among men, were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy, lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our hand is high; the Lord hath not done all this." Here you see is an express reservation of the Jews from destruction for a season; and, accordingly, here they are in our midst. God has preserved them from generation to generation. The arrangements of human affairs are at God's disposal and not in human hands, although men think they are the initiators in the case. Then I conclude this part of the argument by calling attention to this, that at the time spoken of when the promised Messiah shall be manifested in great glory, we read that "He shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Israel from the four corners of the earth", whence it follows that, up to that period, they will be found in that position, and there they now are.

I will now allude to the second point which Mr. Bradlaugh equally failed to comprehend, which is that the truthfulness of the Scriptures requires that there should be at this day a dominant Christianity — political, tyrannical, and corrupt — a complete perversion of the original thing. I now call attention to the proofs of this. I begin with Paul, who, in Acts 20:28, says: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and unto all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers; feed the flock of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this that, *after my departure*, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock, also *of your own selves* shall men arise and SPEAK PERVERSE THINGS." In writing to Timothy (4th chapter 3rd verse) he says: "The time will come when *they will not endure sound doctrine*: but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." There we have a prediction of departure from the truth as apostolically delivered. I now produce the evidence that this was to grow into a political shape, and give the world an

ecclesiastical imposture, supported by the sword. Paul's brethren in Thessalonica had been agitated about the coming of Christ as an event which was about to happen, but he knew it could not happen until certain things occurred. In 2 Thess. 2 he tells us what these certain things are. he says: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God . . . And now ye know what withholdeth that he should be revealed in his time. Only he who hindereth will hinder till he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy *with the brightness of his coming*." Therefore, according to Paul's prophetic foresight, there ought to have been in our past times an extensive corruption of Christianity, resulting in the development of a pretender to divine authority, who, as one head over all, should exhibit himself as a prominent object of the highest homage upon earth. I ask if the whole of this great prophecy has not exactly been realised? What is the most conspicuous feature of the history of Europe but the spectacle of a man in the name of Christ claiming the highest authority, and lording it over the kings and governments of the earth? And what is the foundation upon which he rests but an extensive professedly Christian society in all the countries of Europe, which has nothing in common with the faith originally preached by the apostles? The mischief that led to this result had begun to work in the days of the apostles. Paul says to Timothy that a whole district had turned away from him (2 Timothy 1:15):—"This thou knowest that *all they which are in Asia* be turned away from me, of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes." According to John, the longest-lived disciple of Christ, the departure from apostolic principles had become so serious in his day that it was necessary to try every professor whether he was true or not. See 1 John 4:1-7 for this. The history of European Christianity is not the history of a truly apostolic thing. Mr. Bradlaugh was not too fervid in his denunciations of the system which has cursed Europe for so many centuries. His mistake was to make the Bible responsible for that system, to the symbolic prediction of whose uprising and success I now call your attention. Revelation 17:1:—"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, 'Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness, and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of

the Earth.” We are told in the 6th verse that John “wondered with great admiration”, at the spectacle, and the angel explains to him the meaning of what he has seen. It is to that explanation I now call attention as furnishing the prophecy in question. First of all what is the meaning of the woman? and before we seek the answer to that, I would remind you that the community of Christ — those who are true to him and keep his commandments, are likened to a bride, a chaste virgin, espoused to an absent husband for whom she is waiting. Here, in the symbol before us, we have a false woman riding upon a scarlet-coloured beast. It is important to notice this in preparation for the explanation which identifies a false church with the symbol. I hope Mr. Bradlaugh won't make fun of the scarlet-coloured beast, for I presume he does not despise the British Lion. Symbolism is appropriate in its place. If we have a more hideous symbol than the British Lion to deal with here, it is because we have a more hideous system represented. In the 18th verse, we have the answer as to who the woman is: “And the woman which thou sawest is *that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.*” I am sure there will be no dispute between Mr. Bradlaugh and myself as to what city that was. Rome exercised imperial power over the whole world at that time.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: No.

Mr. ROBERTS: Over the whole civilised world. Rome is here represented as having ecclesiastical relations with the kings of the earth, which answers to history exactly. “The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth” — Rome is on seven hills. And there are seven kings: five *are fallen*, one is and the other is not yet come.” The Roman symbol comprehended a representation of the seven forms of sovereignty that have been located on the seven hills of the topographical Rome. Up to the time of John's prophecy five forms of government had passed over those seven hills since the time of Romulus: the sixth (the imperial) existed at the time of the vision. The seventh prevailed for a short time, as the prophecy states, and the eighth, the Papal, is of the seven, for it is only another form for the Pagan; it is Paganism under a new name. I say that the history of Rome verifies in a marked manner these predictions of the apostles Paul and John. The complaint that the present system is a hideous system is well founded, but that complaint is an unwitting testimony to the truth of this great prediction. A religious apostacy, taking a political shape was to make all the nations of the earth drunk with false doctrine and sentiment; and the proof of its having accomplished this bemuddling mission is seen in the fact that when anyone attempts to present the sober truth of God, he is set down by religious people as an infidel or heretic.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: On the first night of the debate, and again to-night, Mr. Roberts said he would contend that the prophecies of the Bible were so explicit, so sober and so useful in their character, being, in this respect, so unlike the vague,

incoherent and irrational predictions of the Greek augurs, as of themselves to prove the divinity of the Bible. Sober! Useful! Explicit! If you have heard one word that has been either sober, useful or explicit, all I can say is you are a great deal more clever at listening than I am. There is one pretence of explicitness, and that is the case of Luke 21, in which there is an "explicit" reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. But Mr. Roberts must have forgotten that the gospel of Luke was not written before Jerusalem was destroyed; but, on the contrary, there is not a particle of evidence of the existence of the gospel before A.D. 150, and the earliest is much later than that. Although he has the coolness to tell you that with respect to the ancient fathers, he was content to call witnesses, he could do without them. I remember that the truth of the evidence came from my side and not his. He pretended to hand his evidence from the fathers to the chairman, and then when I came to question him about them, they vanished into thin mist. On my part, I called as a witness Clement, and was told an idiot could give evidence like that. I called Justin Martyr; Mr. Roberts said he was "trashy". I thought so, too, and so on, with the others. Then he has quoted a prophecy from Hosea, forgetting that, during the dispersion and captivity of the Jews, the whole of their records were swept away, and swept away, too, because they were in the way. Then we had a reference to 2 Thess. 2, which Mr. Roberts had a very curious way of reading. Turning to the chapter, you will find that Mr. Roberts stopped at the word "coming", at the end of the 8th verse, though not a completed sentence. If he had read on he would find that "for this cause, God shall send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie". I don't know whether it struck him as remarkably inconvenient, or whether he thought it rather too expressive. Certainly the reading was vague enough. He next brought you to the 17th chapter of the Revelation, with its filthy, disgusting language, which he hoped I would not turn into fun, but whose extreme filth was revolting in reading. The 4th verse it requires the height of human audacity to read. There is nothing more revolting to my way of thinking. Mr. Roberts it cannot shock apparently. The woman had "a golden cup in her hand, full of abomination and filthiness of her fornication." Is there abomination of language more filthy and disgusting in any book you ever read in the world? Mr. Roberts says that these prophecies of the Bible are explicit, are sober, are useful. Does this refer to such twaddle as women sitting upon waters and scarlet beasts, with so many heads and so many horns. I want Mr. Roberts to say if that revelation is explicit. It is simply not explicit; it is simply incoherent and irrational. Then he talks of John as the oldest living disciple of Christ. Where is there a particle of evidence of that? It is simply an impertinent assertion. He says that Mr. Bradlaugh is fond of figures of speech, or does not despise emblems, or something of that sort. I am fond of them, but I don't like filth, and the whole Bible is full of filth. In Hosea, Ezekiel, and Nehemiah it abounds, and the only way of regarding it is as the outcoming of an ignorant and barbarous age. Hosea seems to have entirely lost all sense of decency. Read, if you please, the second chapter. Mr. Roberts says they are not vague. If sober, they are irrelevant, "Plead

with your mother, plead; for she is not my wife, neither am I her husband; let her, therefore, put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts; lest I strip her naked, and set her as in the day that she was born, and make her as a wilderness, and set her like a dry land, and slay her with her thirst. I will not have mercy upon her children, for they be the children of whoredoms." I might read you filthy passage after filthy passage, but I don't like, especially in the presence of ladies. I have not provoked this. These are not our books. You say they are not vague. Perhaps not, sometimes, but they are not sober; and when explicit not useful. If they appeared in any book but the Bible, they would have been suppressed by the society formed for the suppression of indecent publications and seized wherever they were placed (A VOICE: "Shakespeare.") Shakespeare! Yes, but Shakespeare don't pretend to be a revelation from God to man. I will refrain from reading more of those texts. I should not have used the few I have at all, only I wanted to base what seemed to me an important argument upon them. From gross-minded people we get low figures; from degraded men we get degraded figures; from low people we get licentious arguments; from disgusting men we get disgusting figures. Such things could not have come from an all-wise God. I regretted for the sake of this meeting there was the slightest necessity for dealing with the subject. I can understand it must have been as painful to you as it is to me. But as you had brought before you an example of a horribly filthy passage, I was bound to show you to what such passages lead.

Let us, if you please, pass on to another part of the subject. The Assyrian slabs and Egyptian monuments we are told are not easily deciphered, and when deciphered are not useful. Mr. Roberts is of that opinion, and coming from him it is no doubt entitled to some weight, as my own knowledge is only second-hand, and I have no ability to translate the hieroglyphs of Egypt. Relying upon second-hand information, therefore, it is quite possible I may be misled, but as far as I have been able to follow these hieroglyphs, opinions upon them vary much, and there is no perfectly safe ground for their interpretation. Until I know something more about them than I do at present I should say it would be better not to introduce them at all. Mr. Roberts says that at the end of the first century Rome was a great city reigning over all kings, and when I corrected him he said civilized kings. First, there is nothing about civilized kings in the Bible, and next Mr. Roberts might have known, if he had been explicit enough, that China was as civilized as the bulk of Europe and a portion of Hindostan. To pretend that this city of Rome reigned over all the kings of the world was as perfect a piece of pretence as could be imagined. Early in this debate Mr. Roberts said he would show that there was historic harmony in the Bible not only with the facts, but in relation to the history and the measure of the duration of the world. I pointed to the Egyptian chronicles and to the Septuagint. Is there historic harmony with these? The Bible limits the face of the earth to 6,000 years, while these go back far longer than that. The other day they opened some caverns in a neighbouring

county and they found buried there remains which in the silent and increasing march of events, must have been deposited there when England and France were united together, which must have been hundreds of thousands of years ago. Talk of harmony in hieroglyphics 15,000 years old! Panglos' discoveries speak — discoveries which show that Egypt existed 5,000 years before Eden's foolish story sounded in the world. There could be nothing more vague, nothing less sober, nothing more incoherent, nothing more irrational. What is the story? God makes one man and one woman, and places this man and woman in a garden, the fruit of one tree of which they were forbidden to eat. The tree was placed within reach and very tempting to the eye, and was, moreover, the tree of knowledge of good and evil. As long as man withstood the temptation all was well. But at length the serpent, wiser than the other beasts of the field, persuades the woman in her husband's absence to partake of the fruit. She does so, tempts her husband to do the same. He does so, and this caused the Almighty to turn round and curse the world. I am told that there is prophecy in it. The prophecy was contained in the curse pronounced upon the serpent:—"Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." That is supposed to be sober, explicit, and useful prophecy. To me it seems as vague, incoherent, and irrational as any that ever appeared in any language. Again, Mr. Roberts, in his first speech, said there were apparent contradictions and discrepancies, but that, when examined by himself, they would melt away one by one. I have given 150 of these discrepancies and contradictions and absurdities. How many of them has he tried to answer? He has referred to the sentiments running through the Bible as evidence of its divinity. Why! they are sentiments of which the readers of the Bible are beginning to be ashamed of. I have produced sentiments as to the treatment of women and training of children — sentiments of giving to men of one nation power over the liberties and persons of their neighbours — sentiments with respect to doctrines which, as good and true men, they must regard as immoral and barbarous — sentiments regarding the actions of immoral men, particularly David, the man "after God's own heart", who never went astray, and, except in the case of Uriah the Hittite, did right in the eyes of the Lord, but still stole a little, robbed a little, was a liar, a thief, and a tenfold scoundrel; and these are anomalies which Mr. Roberts has not attempted to explain.

The CHAIRMAN: I had hoped, after the experience of our first meeting, that weak-minded people who could not command their feelings would have stayed at home, and that egotistical people would have sent challenges of their own to the disputants against whose sentiments they wished to protest. The troublers are so much in the minority that I trust to the general sense of the meeting to keep them

quiet, and to see that they shall have respect for the meeting. Do let us maintain order during the rest of the debate. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Bradlaugh will each occupy a quarter of an hour with the option of making a speech or of asking questions. Mr. Roberts will begin.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. BRADLAUGH.

If I understood you correctly last night, you do not say the New Testament is a collection of forged writings? — I said I did not hold the doctrine that the Bible as a whole was the work of forgers; that I held that the Bible, like other books, amongst much that was mythical, had a basis of truth round which the myths were centred.

May not Paul have existed and written the epistles if the New Testament is not a collection of forgeries? — You have given me at present no authentication of the letters you call Paul's and therefore can base no question upon them.

My question is based upon your statement that the New Testament is not composed of forgeries. I ask if the New Testament was not forged, is it not an honest production? — I have given you an answer. There may have been those who contributed their own amount of what was false and while other parts may have a basis of truth.

Do you not admit — I make no admission whatsoever. I said last night the onus of proof lies with you.

I ask you to say finally whether the New Testament, or any portion of it was according to your conception of it, forged for the purpose of deceiving the people? — I don't mean to say that there might not be contributions and interpretations which may not be deceptions.

Do I understand you to say that of the 2nd Epistle of Paul to Timothy? — It all depends upon the evidence.

Presumably you know the evidence, and I am asking whether your answer applies to Timothy? — You are wrongly putting my answer. I have not the slightest evidence to enable me to identify any person whom you designate as Paul, or the person Timothy, to whom the epistle is said to have been written, and therefore am not unwise enough to express an opinion without having sufficient evidence.

Have you sufficient evidence to form an opinion — yea or nay? — I reply that I have no evidence of the fact.

What is your opinion of the fact? — My opinion is not evidence, and I have no facts to found an opinion upon.

You have the fact of the epistle existing and circulating for centuries, and upon that fact I ask for your opinion as to its genuineness? — It is my opinion that I have no evidence.

Do you refuse then to say that the 2nd Epistle to Timothy is a forgery? — If you mean, is it probable that Paul wrote it, my answer is that, as I have no knowledge about Paul, I cannot speak about his epistles, and I am not so foolish as to be drawn into the position of saying that a forgery had been committed, when I have no evidence on the subject.

Do I understand then that you know nothing about it? — I know more about it than you may suppose.

Tell me, then, is it a forgery? — The bulk of the evidence for it, I have no doubt, has been forged evidence.

I ask you for your opinion, and you tell me about the evidence. — The bulk of the evidence, during the first eight centuries, was forgery without doubt.

I am asking you about the 2nd epistle of Paul to Timothy. — And I cannot give any opinion apart from the evidence which I say has been forged — the bulk of it.

You evade my question: I ask you as to the 2nd epistle of Paul to Timothy; and you refer me to other writings. My question is, whether, in your opinion, on whatever ground you have formed that opinion, Timothy is a forgery? — I am of opinion, if you have *bona fide* evidence that Paul wrote it, the evidence should be produced.

I have now been asking you for some time, Mr. Bradlaugh, whether you believe that the 2nd epistle of Timothy was written by Paul, or is a forgery, and you do not answer the question. — I answer I know nothing about Paul. I have answered the question satisfactorily to myself. The evidence of the epistles — I have read the bulk of what is alleged to be evidence — and I believe it to be a forgery. Beyond that which is strict evidence, you will get nothing from me.

Say yes or no. Is it in your opinion Paul's letter or not? — I won't say that. You won't get me to go into a trap — (laughter). I have a letter in my possession — how can I tell whether a letter has been forged or no, when I don't know who wrote it.

I should say in such a case, "I am in ignorance of the entire matter, and cannot form an opinion," but I most certainly thought Mr. Charles Bradlaugh had formed an opinion, and I merely ask what that opinion is. — Your question began with a statement about ignorant persons. I say that I have examined the Christian evidence as cited by the whole of the writers, and the presumption formed in my mind is against the professions of the epistles, but I decline to be entrapped into saying what might convey more than I might mean.

My question is based upon the examination you have made. I merely ask, have you formed a definite opinion? if so, what is it? — I have given you a definite opinion.

What is it? — My definite opinion is that I have not the slightest evidence.

I ask your opinion, and you tell me about the evidence. — Apart from the evidence I have no opinion.

But you can tell me what your opinion is on the evidence. — My opinion is I am giving answers to a man who does not comprehend them.

All I wish you to do, Mr. Bradlaugh, is to take positive ground one way or the other as to the character of the second epistle of Paul to Timothy. — My opinion was expressed six days ago. My opinion is that you cannot connect Paul with it.

I ask you do you discover anything in the epistles themselves to justify the supposition that they were forged? — Yes, I have clear evidence, and if you examine the Christian evidences you will find that the titles to the Old and New Testaments have been held to be forged.

I am not speaking as to the titles. — I have not finished. I was saying that the ecclesiastical writers of the earlier ages used the names of people not connected with the book at all. I refer to the titles distinguishing between them and the contents of the letters. There is nothing in the contents to show the authorship.

I can understand that a work may not be Charles Bradlaugh's though it has "C. Bradlaugh" affixed to it; but here we have in the body of the letter a statement like this: "Paul, the apostle of Jesus Christ to Timothy", do you say that was not written by the writer of the letter? — I have not the slightest evidence connecting the writer of the prefix with the body of the letter*, and further than that I can give no answer.

MR. BRADLAUGH QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

Do you admit my definition of life as applied to man? — I don't recollect what your definition was.

Do you mean seriously to tell me that you have forgotten my definition of life last night? — Yes, but if you will repeat it, I will tell you whether I agree with it.

Kindly tell me your ideas of life as applied to a man and as applied to an elephant. — I believe it is the same in both cases.

You have read Eccles. 3:18? — Yes.

Mr. B., (reading): "I have said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves

* The body of most of Paul's letters contain the expression, "I, Paul", frequently, e.g.: 2 Cor. 10:1.

are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth the beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence over a beast; for all is vanity." — Yes, those words are there.

Do you think those words are God's authentic revelation to man? — Yes.

Do you consider that a sheep which has been killed by your butcher, of which you have eaten part, will continue to live despite that eating? — No.

Do you consider that a man who has been dined on by the Patagonians will continue to live despite that dining? — No: not unless he is raised.

Have you sufficient memory to serve you as to the plagues of Egypt? — Perhaps.

Is it a fact that God afflicted the land with a plague of murrain, which killed the whole of the cattle in the land, excepting the cattle of the children of Israel? I refer you to the 9th chapter of Exodus and the 6th verse. Is it the fact that after the whole of the cattle of the land had been killed, God, in the 19th verse, sent a warning so that those that were left might be taken out of the field and not die? — I prefer you to read it as it is.

Does it say, in the 19th verse: "Send, therefore, now, and gather thy cattle, and all that thou hast in the field; for upon every man and beast which shall be found in the field, and shall not be brought home, the hail shall come down upon them and they shall die? — Yes.

Is it a fact that some of them regarded the word and fled? — Yes.

Do you consider it probable that they fled away after they had been killed. Don't you consider that an improbability though the book states it? — The book does not state that.

Read it. Read all relating to the cattle fleeing out of the field, and see if it doesn't. — There is no occasion to read anything besides what you have read.

Is it true that later than that, God destroyed the firstborn of man and beast throughout the whole of the land of Egypt? — Yes.

All the cattle having been previously dead? — All that did die.

The words are: "And all the cattle of Egypt died." Read from the 2nd to the 6th verse, and say if it don't mean all the cattle? — It means all the cattle that were meant.

How much less than "all"? Is not all the money in my pocket all the money? — That is a trifling way of putting it.

Can anything be trifling that helps to clear up God's Word? — In the abstract, of course not.

Then please clear up how all the cattle can mean less than all the cattle. — If I knew all the circumstances which the writer had before his mind, in their details, I could do so.

Oh, that is your answer, is it? — My answer is that the book, being otherwise proved reliable, my ignorance of the details does not preclude my believing it to be a divine revelation.

You said, last night, you had enough of evidence of the divinity of the book in the establishment of Christianity by miracle: is it not a fact that all people who pretended to perform miracles pretended to perform them by supernatural power? — No doubt.

Most of those who claim to perform miracles claim to do so by supernatural power? — Yes, but to claim a thing is not to prove it.

Did I understand you to say that slavery as the injunction of Leviticus was justifiable? I think your statement was that savage people might be dealt with as animals? — I don't recollect my precise words.

You said they were in the position of animals, and that the Jews had a right to kill them. — God's right transferred to the Jews.

Does the Bible say that the serpent was condemned to go on his belly as punishment? — Yes.

Do you think that, before his condemnation, he went on his head, his tail, or his back? — I don't know.

And I am sure I don't — (laughter). Do you hold that, at some time in the history of the world, there was an actual tree bearing fruit, the eating of which would give a man education? — I must know in what sense you use the word education.

If you ask me, it means knowledge: "The tree of knowledge of good and evil": was there such a tree? — Yes.

Do you think there are similar trees existing to-day? — No.

In your opinion, what has become of the genus? — It was not a genus.

Then what has become of the individual specimen? — I fancy it must have gone long ago.

So do I — (laughter). Will you kindly tell me how you make three days and three nights between late on Friday night and early on Sunday morning? — I don't make it.

Is it true, as the gospels represent, that Joseph of Arimathea begged the body of Jesus on Friday evening? — No.

When was it? — Thursday.

Where shall I find that? — In Luke 24.

In the 24th of Luke I don't see anything about Thursday. I know where it is written, "We trusted it had been he. Besides all this, to-day is *the third day*?" — "The third day SINCE"; consequently Saturday was the second day "since", and Friday the first day "since", and Thursday the day itself.

When it says that Joseph of Arimathea begged the body, according to the 23rd of Luke 50-54, it was in the evening, as "the Sabbath drew on"? — That was the Sabbath connected with the Passover. Two Sabbaths came together.

Will you kindly give two Sabbaths. — You will find it in Matt. 28:1.

(Looks.) There is only one Sabbath mentioned in Matt. 28:1. — The word is plural in the Greek. There is my Greek Testament (producing a book).

I have nothing to do with the Greek. We have agreed to take the authorised English version throughout. I asked, as my first question, if we were to be bound by the authorised English version, and it is simply a trick to refer to the Greek Testament when we have debated on the authorised version all through. — (Time called.)

The CHAIRMAN: We have only one hour left. Let us listen with the utmost quietness. Mr. Roberts now speaks for a quarter of an hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am surprised that Mr. Bradlaugh should insist on an English translation when the original is presented to him illustrative of a point referred to. When he asked me to be bound by the English version, I did not understand him to exclude the original from which it is made. I understood him to mean the English version and its original, as distinguished from the Septuagint and other versions which are different. A version is the same in all the languages it may be translated into: the original of course governs all. With regard to Mr. Bradlaugh's remarks upon my opening speech, I am not quite sure whether I am right in giving him credit for sincerity in the disgust he expressed at the chapter I quoted. Not that I wish to dispute his sincerity in any offensive sense. I have no doubt that in measure he is sincere to his cause, but I cannot conceive any really thoughtful man objecting to Rev. 17, on the ground of delicacy; I cannot think of a better answer than the words of Paul, "to the pure all things are pure, but to the unbelieving, and defiled nothing is clean." The Bible deals with facts; and its unvarnished delineations of them is one evidence of its divinity. It is unhampered by human delicacies. If it has a bad thing to speak of, it speaks of it. If it has a bad thing to symbolise, it symbolises it in a character befitting it. Then Mr. Bradlaugh asks, why was not the book of Revelation written plainly? I should like to ask him if even all human compositions are plain? Are there not problems in Euclid, allegorical pictures, in paintings and hieroglyphs on stone? Are there not emblems

connected with the various secret orders? All these might be considered as open to the same remarks, if Mr. Bradlaugh's objection is reasonable. But in point of fact it is not reasonable. Advanced matters are treated in an advanced way. You would not speak to educated men as you would to those you wished to instruct. The book of Revelation was written for a particular class. They are described in the opening verses as "the servants of Jesus Christ." Now the servants of Jesus Christ are instructed in first principles, and the principles furnish the clue to an interpretation of this book which they have in their hands. To them the book is intelligible and interesting. The knowledge it communicates is valuable to them and accessible. Its symbolical character is a veil only to those for whom its contents were never intended. With regard to historical correspondences, I acknowledge that Mr. Bradlaugh is right when he says I have not done what I said I would do; I can only say my omission to do so is not from want of materials, but simply because it has been a matter of impossibility to introduce them during the time at our disposal. On some subsequent occasion I may take the opportunity of bringing them forward. To-night I have put forward some strong things, which so far Mr. Bradlaugh has entirely failed to answer. Perhaps, here, I may refer to his allusions to the discovery of human remains said to belong to times anterior to our own race. I would simply say that the discovery of such remains, even granting all that is claimed for them, would not be anything against the Bible because it is a teaching of the Bible that there was a race on the earth preceding the chaos which prevailed 6,000 years ago, at the time Adam appears on the scene. A disaster to the race occurred, probably resulting in the pre-Adamite chaos; and the remains found may go back to that time without invalidating the Bible account of our own race. Our own race cannot be carried farther back than the Bible puts it. It is a simple mathematical calculation. Population increases at a known rate. Reckon the rate backwards and you cannot carry the present farther back than the time of Noah.

With regard to prophecy, I have produced the case of the Jews, and the case of the corrupt ecclesiasticism of Europe. I now refer to Isaiah's prediction of the downfall of Babylon (Isaiah 13:19); Ezekiel's prediction of the downfall of Egypt (Ezekiel 29:12-15); also his prediction of the destruction of Tyre (Ezekiel 28:6-18), a power at that time occupying a great commercial position in the world, answering the position in the present day of Great Britain. Then I produce Daniel's prophecy of the uprise of the four empires (Daniel 2 and 7). I cannot, in a quarter of an hour, elaborate these; I ask you to refer to them at home and see whether or not these predictions are there. One particular illustration I will refer to, though involving the symbols which brings the jeer to Mr. Bradlaugh's lips. The date of the prophecy is B.C. 553, and the events to which it relates occurred about 300 years before Christ. Daniel saw in a vision a goat and ram with two horns, representing the empires of Persia and Greece, as the angel showing the vision told Daniel. The goat, representing Greece, had a great horn, which was broken in the encounter with the ram, and from the great horn there sprang up

four smaller horns. This was explained to mean that, when the Greek empire should appear on the scene, its first ruler would die, and his empire be divided into four parts outside his family. Now, we well know that, after Persia was conquered by Alexander, he died without issue, and his empire was divided among his four generals — a fact referred to in the 11th chapter of Daniel, thus:— “A mighty king shall stand up that shall rule with great dominion and do according to his will. And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up even for others beside those.” I dare say Mr. Bradlaugh, with his usual adroitness, will say that this is a forgery; but intelligent men are not to be scared away from truth by these reckless assertions. There are unquestionable matters of fact which lead logically to certain great conclusions, which may not possibly be apparent to everyone and which may be caricatured but which are still undeniably true. Even in science this is the case. Some scientific experiments are so refined as to be only understood by few; and yet, conducted in a calm and skilful manner, yield demonstrated truth upon which great public conveniences are founded. I might refer on the subject of prophecy to the history of Christ, in so far as it was unfolded during the thirty-three years and a half he sojourned on earth. The time of his appearing, the character of his ministry, and the nature of his death, were all foretold with a minuteness which cannot be accounted for on any other principle than that the prophets were guided by the Spirit of God.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Mr. Roberts says he never meant it to be understood that we were to be bound, in this debate, by the ordinary English version. But I will remind him that, in my first speech, I said I should assume, for the purposes of this debate, that he meant the ordinary authorised English version, beginning with the Book of Genesis and ending with the Book of Revelation; and supposing I might happen to be wrong, I asked him if that was his meaning, and he said “Yes”. It was the very first question I asked him: “Do you mean by ‘the Scriptures’ or by ‘these Scriptures’ the authorised English version of the Bible, commencing with Genesis and ending with Revelation?” Mr. Roberts’ answer was “Yes”. If that is not explicit language, language can have no meaning. If Mr. Roberts does not remember it, he ought never to enter into another debate. Then what does he say? He says that which positively I confess I cannot understand: that some version other than the English would distinguish a Sabbath preceding the Passover from the ordinary Jewish Sabbath, and that in fact there were two Sabbaths. Does he suppose I will admit that? He does not suppose anything of the kind. He says there is a Greek version. I know that. I have thirty of them at home; and I know that none of them I have yet seen speak of a second Sabbath or two Sabbaths. All the books I have seen speak of “the first day of the week”. Then Mr. Roberts spoke about Mr. Bradlaugh’s “class”. I might mention Sir Charles Lyall as one of my class, Baron Bunsen, and there are a few more of my class; and

as we have, amongst others, the evidence of these men, it is rather unfair to talk of Mr. Bradlaugh's class, because Mr. Roberts knows nothing about them. But with respect to the remains I spoke of, Mr. Roberts suggests that they might have belonged to a pre-Adamite period. In that case, the Bible is disproved; for it says Adam was the first man. We are told that the first man Adam was made a living soul. According to Mr. Roberts the first man was not the first man; and if there was a pre-Adamite man there is no truth that Jesus Christ came into the world to save the descendants of the first man. Then take the case of the prophecy of Daniel, the date of which Mr. Roberts gives as 553 B.C., and which he says relates to something which happened after that. He has proved nothing about the date of 553 B.C., although challenged over and over again to produce proofs of the dates he specifies. How dare he pretend that 553 B.C. is an accurate date? He might just as well have said twenty or a million, or any other date, but simply it suited his own purpose. It is about as funny a way of conducting a debate as anyone could adopt. Oh, Mr. Roberts says, but of course, Mr. Bradlaugh will say that this is a forgery. This word forgery is a convenient word, when wanting to describe in the future time what has already taken place. I might, in describing what would be the result of another quarrel, give a warning as to how the quarrel would begin. Unless you can tell me when Daniel was written you have no right to claim it as a prophecy. Mr. Roberts cannot even show that it was not written after the event, and it is a deliberate impertinence to assume that upon which the whole argument turns. If you please, let me draw your attention to the fact that Mr. Roberts changes the whole course of things, and brings about a revolution of religious sentiment. He says that "to the pure all things are pure", and thereby justifies those people who are prosecuted for selling things which we say are not pure. There is no justification for a man taking a coarse and filthy way of stating a thing, when we might have taken a pure way of stating it.

We have now got near the end of this debate. One point upon which our friend has complained is that he has not had time to elaborate his arguments, but this might have been obviated if he had not read so many texts. He says that I have dealt with these things in a way that he won't criticise as unfair. In this case I did not come here — I never have come to any place — to plead for a foregone conclusion, regardless of what could be said on the other side. I have always been ready to listen to the arguments of an adversary. You will admit that I have met every point with distinctness and as directly as possible. If Mr. Roberts has not heard my explanation it is not my fault. To prove that this book is a revelation from God it seems to me absurd that a debate should be conducted solely in reference to its internal contents, without respect to its history outside. To answer me with a pile of texts is no answer at all. It is an admission that the spokesman has undertaken a task which he ought not to have undertaken at all. The jury to whom he has submitted the case during the six nights of the debate, have no evidence outside the book for any of the books of the Bible. For the Old Testament none exist, so far as Mr. Roberts knows; for the New Testament, a number of names have been given to you, Mr. Roberts carefully refraining, until

pressed by me, from giving those names. When still further pressed on the subject, he had nothing practically to produce beyond the book. He certainly did quote Athenagoras with a pretence upon which I do not congratulate him. He fixed the date of Athenagoras at A.D. 180, but his witness never mentions one of the gospels or the names of their writers. This cannot be said to have sprung, as a mine, upon Mr. Roberts, because he had been challenged by me to produce his witnesses. He did so, but then discovered that they were "trash". When we come to the book itself, we have the statement from Mr. Roberts that the people of the world, with the exception of a few descendants of Abraham, were as animals, and that God had, no doubt, in mercy, justice, and love transferred them to the Jews for ever as bondsmen, and as the sport of their cruelty, lust, and pride — a position so terrible as to make any man shudder. I shall only have one further opportunity of addressing you. I am obliged to you for having treated me as you have. I beg, during the few minutes I have to speak, at any rate, to say that we have no other object than the common object of truth. Don't look upon our class as if it was few or weak. It is a growing class. It is a class increasing in influence with respect to the education of the day. It consists of those who have been struggling for the education of the country during the last fifty years. It is a class worthy of a better advocate than he who stands before you at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Roberts will now deliver his concluding speech for which he is to be allowed the full time.

Mr. ROBERTS: And now, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we have reached the end of the discussion. It has not been so entirely satisfactory as might have been wished; but it has been as much so as was to be expected with the limited time at disposal and the broken form into which the discussion has necessarily been thrown. I, for one, am well content with the result. I have established a series of propositions which, in their combined force, place it beyond all reasonable doubt, that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation.

I have proved that, beginning where we stand, the state of the facts now existing in the world is such as ought to exist on the hypothesis that the Bible is true.

I have proved that there is in contemporary literature sufficient evidence of the fact of the Scriptures having existed at the time they profess to have begun to be in circulation, although admitting that such evidence is not necessary in the presence of the far weightier evidences of their divinity that exist.

I have proved that the unquestionable facts connected with the establishment of Christianity in the world in the first century, are incapable of being explained on

any rational principle apart from the New Testament account that Christ rose from the dead, and that power to work miracles was bestowed on the apostles. I have proved that the single case of the apostle Paul, when all the facts of his unimpeachable history are distinctly realised and logically construed, is sufficient of itself to prove the divinity of Christ, and therefore of the entire Scriptures. I have proved that the literary and moral peculiarities of the Bible are at variance with the supposition of its being a human production, though this argument I have not had time to elaborate to the extent I should have liked. I have proved that the history of the Jewish nation, particularly as involving the character and career of Moses, cannot be explained on the Freethinker's hypothesis of the Bible; but on the contrary, is an irrefragable proof of its divine character and authorship.

And lastly, I have proved that the prophecies of the Bible — fulfilled in the past, and now fulfilling before our eyes — are an irresistible evidence of their divine character.

How have these arguments been met? Has there been any attempt to grapple with them on their merits? None whatever. Mr. Bradlaugh, instead of attempting to break the chain of my reasoning, has hurled at me, in his indiscriminating way, a number of detached features of Bible things, which he alleges to be contradictory of the professed character and teaching of the Bible. Even if his contention about them had been correct, their citation was no answer to the argument I have submitted. But what are we to say to them when they turn out to be mere points of *ex parte* declamation. Mr. Bradlaugh professes to find things in the Bible inconsistent with what he thinks God ought to be and to do; therefore these things are inconsistent with the God the Bible reveals. Extraordinary reasoning! I have disposed of some of his objections; and it will be on public record in this discussion that I offer at any time, in public contest with Mr. Bradlaugh, to answer or explain all that he can produce, when he will consent to affirm the Bible is an imposture, and so give me the opportunity of disproving the arguments he will advance in support of his affirmation.

Then he has endeavoured to embarrass me on the mere question of technical reference to writings whose existence is notorious to all the world. He knew that in one or two cases the name of a non-existent work was all that was relied upon as proving the existence of the New Testament at the date of that work's production; yet he insisted on the production of the work, while refusing to recognise the weight of those actually produced. It is immaterial to the purpose for which I used them whether they were really the works of their professed authors or not. They were written in the first and second centuries; it matters not by whom. They quote the New Testament many times over, which shows the New Testament existed at the time they were written, and this was all the use I sought to make of them. But I could have dispensed with them; the argument is irresistible without them. My reference to them only gave Mr. Bradlaugh an opportunity of appearing to advantage, which he would otherwise have lacked.

Well, I do not blame Mr. Bradlaugh for his tactics. They were the only tactics available to him in the discussion if he was to appear to show any fight at all. He could make no headway against the overwhelming arguments in defence of the Bible. In the eyes of his friends he could not even appear to make a stand, except by giving to these irrelevant matters a prominence that does not logically belong to them. I will allow he has made a good handling of a very bad case.

But what does his contention amount to, even supposing we were for a moment to allow, for the sake of argument, that he had established what he has been contending for? Merely this, that he (Mr. B.), does not believe in the New Testament. It may be true for anything he knows to the contrary; he is inclined to think it is not true, but he cannot prove that is not so, and it is not his business! Is that a position with which a wise man ought to be content on a subject of such tremendous importance? Rather, will not the highest reason impel a man, in such a case, to seek for solid ground of conviction one way or other? A wise man will not be content with a "maybe" in such a matter as this. He will not rest till he is able to say with confidence, "I know this to be a forgery and a lie, for I can prove it", or "I know this to be the truth of God; for it is in my power to give conclusive evidence of it."

I have unfolded an argument during these six nights, imperfect and fragmentary though it be, which justifies a man in taking the second of these confident positions. I have shown by the facts accessible to all men, in connection with the Bible, that God exists, and that He has a glorious purpose with the earth and with man upon it, involving immortal life and perfect well-being to all who may become beneficially related in the way revealed by Christ. Is there no antecedent presumption in favour of such a conclusion, in our own constitution and in the spectacle of heaven and earth around us? Is it reasonable to suppose that the stupendous system of the universe exists for no higher end than the feeble gratification of an ephemeral and decaying race of animals? Is it reasonable to suppose that the aspirations of the noblest of mankind are without a counterpart in the region of the possible? Is it reasonable to suppose that the earnest uplifting of the human heart in agonising desire towards a Higher than man are without a meaning in the universe of being? The vibrations of the needle pointed to the pole long before the existence of such a point on the earth's surface was known. So, in true philosophy, do our fervent longings point to the Almighty Father and Disposer of all things, even if He had not chosen to reveal Himself.

The higher minds of the nation are on the side of my argument in an indirect way. Mr. Gladstone in his article on "Phases of Modern Thought", just published in the *Fortnightly Review*, has told us that in his judgment, the system of negation represented by Mr. Bradlaugh and his friends, is calculated, if generally received, to disintegrate society in the next generation, though its present advocates, through the bias of inherited principles, might continue subject to moral restraint. Professor Tyndall, in the preface to his published addresses, says that mankind

requires the lifting power of a noble ideal. Even John Stuart Mill, born and bred a sceptic, in his last days assumed an attitude indicative of something higher than his atheistic proclivities. The *Daily News* says "Mr. Mill was so far true to his early training that he tried hard to show how small was the intellectual warrant for the misty aspirations; but the 'Time-Spirit' led him again and again to the brink of the abyss after logic had made its final declaration; and his last book reveals him in the attitude of one looking across the ocean of eternity with wistful eyes and something of a fond expectancy. Thus he presents one of the most pathetic figures in all the literature of negation. His aspirations for *something to believe in beyond this petty life* will speak to doubting intellects with intense force. He and such as he testify not that this age is sceptical, but that even sceptical minds *hunger for a religion in which they can believe*. The last century tried to feed the mind on the husks of dry and negative logic, but again has come that yearning for something higher, which has often before been the harvest of new faiths. When essentially scientific intellects like Mill and Tyndall link reverential hopes to strict deduction of the reason, the most careless observer may detect an immense transformation of opinion, and the most timid heart may take comfort."

All these utterances of the intellectual men of our day, point in the direction of a need which the Bible supplies. The Bible gives us the purifying and reforming restraint which Mr. Gladstone sees human society needs. It gives us a divine interdict of evil doing and a divine command of well-doing. The Bible gives us the uplifting ideal of professor Tyndall's declared want. It gives us an ideal glorified man — the manifestation of the Eternal invisible Father of all — a man who once lived in our weak and afflicted state, whose work has already filled the world with light compared with the darkness that reigned before his appearance; a man who now exists in an incorruptible, immortal, omnipotent nature; whose re-appearance in the world will take place at an appointed time for the abolition of every existing form of human government, and the establishment of a divine despotism for the blessing of all mankind, on the foundation of glory to God, to whom alone glory is reasonably due; with whose appearance there is associated this glorious prospect for every friend of his, that he will use the power God has given him to recall them from the oblivion of the grave, or transform them to an immortal state identical with his own, and associate them with himself, with every circumstance of honour and renown, in the perfect order of things he will establish and administer among men in that blessed day of promise, when there shall be no more curse and no more pain, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away. A more uplifting ideal it is impossible to conceive; and as for poor John Stuart Mill's wistful wonderment of the future, the gospel of Christ is the satisfactory and the only answer. There is no solution apart from it. There is no consolation to the intellectual mind apart from it. It gives the believer of it a permanent interest in the universe and its affairs. It takes away the blackness which darkens and shortens the Atheist's horizon; it dispels the fear, the *ennui*, and the gloom, which, at some time or other, invade every man's thought, and rescues him from that

depressing companionship with fossils and death which Mr. Bradlaugh's faith compels him to accept; and gives him instead a fellowship with the Almighty through His Son, and a destiny as glorious and endless as the sun itself.

A knowledge of the truth puts its possessor in the privileged position of being able to explain the conflicts that distract the intellectual world, and to see his way through the labyrinth where others are lost. He turns his back on the priest and preacher, as the scientist does: but he grasps the Bible to his bosom, as the scientist does not, having in the understanding of it, attained to the possession of a religion that he can believe in, without closing his ear to science like the dogmatist, or to the voice of Jewish historic evidence like the scientist — a religion which solves the problem of human existence, mellowing the present with the tranquility of faith, and gilding the future with the brightness of well-founded and rational hope. This is truly a great possession, the value of which is enhanced by the foregoing newspaper picture of intellectual unbelievers looking (vainly) across the ocean of eternity with wistful eyes. Christ is the solution of all anxiety in this direction, and he is to be obtained in the belief and obedience of the truth. "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."

I admit the glory of it has been obscured by a false theology, whose hideousness is due to a mixture of the philosophical speculations of ancient Pagans with the fables of Romish priests, glossed by the thinnest varnish of Scripture phraseology. I admit that, for this reason, men like Mr. Bradlaugh are more to be pitied than blamed. I do pity him. In some respects I like him. And I would tell even him to hope; for the Creator of heaven and earth is gracious and forgiving, and will forgive even blasphemies equal to his, if he will turn and repent and submit himself as a dutiful child to the Everlasting Power, in whose hand his breath is, and whose are all his ways. But he may not hope if he does not repent. Though the reigning darkness of Christendom may excuse him, and his courage and manliness may extenuate the blacker features of his case, the truth compels every friend of it to regard him as a misleader of men to their utter ruin both now and hereafter. In this character I have, at the request of the truth's friends, accepted the present opportunity of strenuously opposing him, in the proof that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I have elected not to occupy your time beyond ten o'clock in allowing Mr. Roberts to proceed with his prepared speech, and shall, I think, be able to limit myself to eight minutes, if allowed to proceed free from interruption. First, I regret that Mr. Roberts, in his written *finale*, should have said that he has produced contemporary evidence. It is not true, as Mr. Roberts has said, that my tactics were directed to irrelevant matters, for had they been irrelevant, I should not have introduced them. I regret that he only relied upon titles and names; and the report will bear me out that he said he had the books here, and that I

challenged their production. He says my position is that the New Testament may be true for anything I know to the contrary. On the contrary, I have given contradictions which show it cannot be true. I regret also that Mr. Roberts should have referred again to the challenge thrown out last night. I had been taught to regard him as the representative of an earnest body of men and women, but I must refuse to accept a second challenge from a man who is incompetent to make out the case he has undertaken to establish. Mr. Roberts says I ought to put it to you that this book is a forgery and a lie, or accept it. Surely I have taken pains to explain to you that I regard the Bible as I do the religious books of every people in the world — none of them entire forgeries, none of them entire lies; all of them the growth of different ages; all of them with a little truth. I have studied them, and if I cannot receive them, it is only because my reason does not permit of my doing so. I am not the best man that could be put forward against them; but I hope you will do me the justice of allowing that whatever may be our differences, I gave a full and a fair hearing to whatever was advanced in their favour, and as full an answer as I am able to give, and so it shall be every time a cause is entrusted to my charge.

I have now the pleasant duty to perform to ask you to pass a vote of thanks to the gentleman, who with so much good temper and so much firmness, has presided over these debates. With this I am sure Mr. Roberts will agree.

Mr. ROBERTS: I second the motion, only regretting that Mr. Bradlaugh and myself cannot agree on higher things. I feel pleasure in joining in this proposition because I believe the good temper and impartial conduct of the chairman has greatly tended to the success and dignity of the debate. I might add as a reason for the vote what may not be known to all, that the chairman has postponed his summer holidays in order to attend to the unsummerlike duty he had undertaken, to preside over this debate.

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN in responding to the vote, said he had listened with great interest to the debate, and had learnt some things from it. There had been some warmth on each side, but not more than might have been expected on such a subject with such earnestness of conviction on each side. He considered that the disputants were both wrong and both right, and if the audience would only come next Sunday to the Chapel where he preached (loud and prolonged laughter), he would try to show them the way in which these things should be looked at.

The meeting then separated.

A REVIEW
OF
THE DISCUSSION.

BY MR. ROBERTS.

MR. ROBERTS has asked and obtained Mr. Bradlaugh's consent to the publication of this review of the discussion at the end of the published report. He has also offered to print along with it any rejoinder Mr. Bradlaugh may choose to write, but Mr. Bradlaugh has not chosen to write a rejoinder. The addition of a review of the discussion by one of the disputants will seem uncalled for and out of place to such as hold with Mr. Bradlaugh that the discussion should stand or fall on its own merits. If Mr. Roberts could limit his view to the discussion as a performance or trial of polemical skill between two men, he would be of the same mind. But this aspect of the case is to him of the least consequence. He cannot shut his eyes to the wider bearings of the affair, as affecting, in however small a degree, the convictions of those who may seek in the reading of this discussion, some acquaintance with the merits of the question debated. This to him is the only important phase of the reported discussion, and has led him to desire and to ask permission to supplement the discussion with a few things necessary to complete the consideration of the subject.

Six nights seems a long time, and long enough to exhaust the subject, or at all events to allow of a very adequate treatment of it. But in the practical working, the case was otherwise. Each disputant had only one hour and a quarter per night, and part of that devoted to interrogation. Even with a full and undisturbed occupation of that time, any one having any acquaintance with the subject will know how small an extent of ground could be covered in an hour. But when it is remembered that a half of that hour was broken into two separate speeches, in reply to speeches from the other side, it will at once be seen that half-an-hour was practically all that was at the disposal of the affirmative side for the elaboration of lines of thought involving really extensive treatment, if at all thoroughly done. The consequence was that the affirmative argument was imperfectly developed, while on the other hand, it was absolutely impossible to deal with a great portion of the hostile details

marshalled so rapidly, and on the whole so skilfully (for a bad cause) on the other side.

To make good the deficiency arising from these causes, Mr. Roberts proposed to Mr. Bradlaugh a second discussion, in which Mr. Bradlaugh should affirm the mythical character of the Scriptures which would have given Mr. Roberts the opportunity of following all his objections, but this Mr. Bradlaugh declined. Consequently, Mr. Roberts' only other course is to add this review, which he thanks Mr. Bradlaugh for consenting to. For convenience sake, the review is divided into six parts, corresponding with the six nights of the debate; and each part into two sections. — 1, the affirmative, and 2, the negative.

FIRST NIGHT.

MR. ROBERTS' ARGUMENT.

The first night may be found somewhat ineffective on the affirmative side. This was due to a cause that could not be appreciated by listeners. It could only be known thoroughly to the speaker himself. A word or two will make it intelligible. Mr. Roberts is in the habit of speaking *extempore* in the absolute sense. But in meeting a man like Mr. Bradlaugh, he felt he must make some degree of preparation. Yet could not prepare to the extent of getting ready speeches verbatim. He had to limit himself to notes. The consequence was that, hampered by notes and not having speeches by heart, he had neither the advantage of complete preparation on the one hand nor the impromptu freshness on the other. This disadvantage was aggravated by the embarrassment natural to meeting an able man for the first time, of whom he had not yet taken the measure, and of commencing the discussion in a large strange hall. The result was that what preparation had taken place was not fully utilized, while the argument put forth lacked the completeness and force that an *extempore* effort would have had.

The importance of the first night's argument will only be appreciated by those with whom the question of the Bible's divinity is a matter of anxiety. By such the argument will be felt to be a vital one and satisfactory. It supposes a man anxious to satisfy himself as to the truth of the Bible. Such a man has it in his power to apply various tests; but obviously the first one is that which relates to what he actually sees and knows for himself. He is living in the world to which the prophecies of the Bible relate. He knows what are the leading features of the affairs of mankind as they now exist. Hence, he can apply an immediate and palpable test of a precise and crucial kind. If it could be shown that the state of things now existing is what ought not to exist according to the Bible, the inquirer would feel that it was needless to proceed another step in the investigation. On the

other hand, if it can be shown that the state of things now existing is exactly what ought to exist, according to the Bible, every one instinctively feels that that is a powerful fact in its favour, and one in fact which almost of its own force proves its divinity. Hence this enquiry is of great consequence in the consideration in question. Mr. Bradlaugh made light of it, and tried as much as possible to conceal its importance from view. But the fact remains that the two great features of the present situation of human affairs are what the Bible requires — the existence and dispersion of the Jews, and the dominant existence in Roman Europe of a political ecclesiasticism, founded on a corruption of apostolic Christianity.

The following are portions of Mr. Roberts' notes, unused in the discussion. The substance of some of them may appear in certain parts of the discussion, but not in this form:—

“The proposition I have to maintain, joyful if true. It lights the horizon with the morning glow of hope, while Mr. Bradlaugh's position is the reverse. Mr. Bradlaugh would extinguish the historic light of Bethlehem. He asks us to believe there is no hope. He would overwhelm us with dreary despair. He would take from us God, and ask us to regard our being as the accidental development of callous force, indiscriminating, unknowing, unconscious, unloving, helpless law, which has brought us thus far, but will not and cannot take us farther. He inscribes the skull and crossbones on his banner, and holds up to us the coffin as our goal.

“I am here to maintain that, in the strict sense, the question is not an open one: not one admitting of a doubt, when the evidence in its entirety is realised. Doubts there always are in some minds; but this is no argument against the truth. Doubt may be the mere result of ignorance of the facts, or incapacity to discern the logical result of facts, or aversion to fairly open the mind to that result.

“The proposition I have to affirm stands on a very broad foundation. It is not a theory depending upon correctness in the process of induction. It is not the question of an isolated historical incident, depending for its credibility upon circumstances easily capable of distortion or suppression. It is not even a matter of creed in the ordinary sense, depending upon modes of reading and argument. It is a great and broad historical matter, embracing in its foundations, current, existing facts; the attested history of mankind, and the known characteristics of human nature in a hundred generations.

“I will show that the truthfulness and divinity of the Bible are shown by every test that can be applied to it.—1. By the facts that ought to exist at the present moment on that hypothesis. 2. By external testimony to its existence in ancient times. 3. By its correspondence with the known history of mankind. 4. By its internal constitution and peculiarities. 5. By the nature of its histories, and 6, by the fulfilment of its prophecies.

“I am not unaware that much may be said against these propositions; but this fact is no disparagement of their truth. Where is the matter, person or thing against which ingenious hostility cannot say something? It is a true proverbial saying, that there are two sides to every question — not that there are two real sides, but two ways of arguing it. Cases in court every day furnish an example. But truth exists for all that.

“It is not an uncommon thing to assume a theory of a matter, and to hammer everything into harmony with that theory, with however much violence to truth. Somebody must have done this in the Tichborne Case. Somebody does it in the present question. You will judge on which side this process is resorted to. I know a gentleman of Mr. Bradlaugh’s persuasion, who on board the *Aleppo*, being cornered on the evidences of Christ’s resurrection, said he would not believe in that resurrection, though he could not dispose of the evidence, because the resurrection was contrary to his experience!

“The plan to work by is to lay hold of what is unquestionably true, and decide all doubtful points in accordance with these. We shall have doubtful matters urged against the Bible. I shall undertake to grapple with and explain these in harmony with the views I present, while, on the other hand, I know it is impossible for the opposing side fairly to dispose of the positive evidences in favour of the truthfulness of the Bible.

“The difficulties against which the argument for the Bible has to contend may be called artificial difficulties — not real, but easily raised with telling effect where ignorance exists, such as 1, the history of Papal Europe; 2, the nature of orthodox doctrines; 3, misconception of Bible teaching; 4, natural sympathy with unbelief.

I.—If the Bible is true, there ought to be Jews now in existence, because besides the evidence adduced in Mr. Roberts’ first speech on the sixth night of the discussion, it is written (Jer. 31:36): “If those ordinances (of heaven and earth) depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall *cease from being a nation before me* for ever.” The existence of the Jews is a fact which is known to all the world.

“If the Bible is true there ought to be extant in the earth a corrupt Christianity, as the basis of the political system of Roman Europe, maintained by the kings thereof; because such was foretold to be the final form into which the community established by the apostles would grow, and it was also foretold that the system so developed would continue in existence and power till the re-appearance of Christ. Proof as follows:—

I.—APOSTASY PREDICTED.

1.—Acts 20:29: After my (Paul’s) departing, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

- 2.—2 Tim. 2:16: Shun (O, Timothy) profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness, and their word will eat as doth a canker.
- 3.—2 Tim. 3:13: Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.
- 4.—2 Tim. 4:3: The time will come when they (Christians—see context) will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears. And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.
- 5.—2 Peter 2:1-2: There shall be false teachers *among you*, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies . . . And *many shall follow their pernicious ways* by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of; and through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you.
- 6.—2 Thess. 2:3: That day shall not come except there come *a falling away first*, and that man of sin be revealed who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped . . . The Mystery of iniquity doth already work.
- 7.—1 John 2:18: Antichrist shall come.

II.—THE PREDICTED APOSTASY BEGUN IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

- 1.—2 Thess. 2:7: The mystery of iniquity *doth already work*.
- 2.—2 Tim. 1:15: This thou knowest that all they which are in *Asia be turned away from me*.
- 3.—1 John 2:18: Even now are there many antichrists.
- 4.—1 John 4:1-5: Many false prophets are gone out into the world . . . and the world heareth them.

III.—THE PREDICTED APOSTASY TO CORRUPT ALL NATIONS.

- 1.—Rev. 17:1-3: The inhabitants of the earth made drunk with the wine of her fornication.—(that is with the teaching of Rome—see last verse of the chapter.)
 - 2.—Rev. 14:8: She made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.
 - 3.—Rev. 18:3: All nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.
 - 4.—Rev. 19:2: She did corrupt the earth with her fornication.
-

IV.—THE PREDICTED APOSTASY TO BE IN EXISTENCE AT THE SECOND APPEARING OF CHRIST.

- 1.—2 Thess. 2:8: Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and destroy *with the brightness of HIS COMING*.
- 2.—Rev. 16:15-19: Behold I (Jesus) come as a thief . . . And Great Babylon (that is Rome—see 17:18) came in remembrance before God to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath.
- 3.—Dan. 7:9-11: The Ancient of Days did sit . . . and the judgment was set and the books were open. And I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake, I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame.

Europe is Roman-ecclesiastical at the present moment — consequently the existent state of things is what the truthfulness of the Bible requires. If the world had been Pagan, as it was when the apostles died; or in a state of enlightened and faithful subjection to the teachings of Christ, this would have been an argument against the Bible.

External evidence of the authenticity of the New Testament.—The collateral testimony to the existence of the Bible at the time it professes to have been produced, is beyond reasonable dispute. As regards the New Testament, there is the uncontradicted tradition of the Christian community from the very beginning, which, on examination, will be found to carry more weight than even the express testimony of individual witnesses. The New Testament is mainly composed of the epistles of Paul, addressed not to persons but to churches. These letters were preserved and read habitually by the various churches to whom they were addressed, which is the best evidence of authenticity that could be produced. Besides being preserved and read by these, they were copied and circulated among all the Christian communities. They were equally used in Alexandria, and Carthage, and Gaul. They are cited by the writers of the second century as commonly and familiarly as by preachers and writers in our own day. The uncontroverted writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement, and Alexandrinus prove this; and the fact is conclusive evidence of their previous currency for a long time, and establishes their authenticity by proving them to have been received by the very communities to whom Paul's letters were severally addressed in the first instance. No demonstration could be more complete than this. It is not in the least affected by the fact that literary forgeries were abundantly perpetrated in the second and third centuries. These forgeries only go to show that there were genuine writings in existence, commanding the confidence and influencing the lives of the Christian community from the very commencement of

its existence. The forgeries are, therefore, indirect evidence in support of the authenticity of the New Testament.

Being authentic, the nature of the contents is evidence of their divinity. The contents would be evidence of divinity, even if the authenticity were in doubt.

MR. BRADLAUGH'S ARGUMENT.

Mr. Bradlaugh says, on page 26: "I do not pretend that at any particular date, some class of ignorant and designing men forged a whole book which they called the Bible, for the purpose of deceiving the people: such would simply be an absurd contention." He also says: "I have never contended . . . that the whole of this Bible is the work of ignorant and designing men." This concession is an indication of the strong position of the Bible with regard to the evidence of its being a genuine production. If Mr. Bradlaugh could have affirmed that the Bible was the work of ignorant and designing men, he would not have scrupled to do so. He says he does not do so, and has never done so. Consequently, on the testimony of its bitterest foe, the Bible is the work of enlightened and candid men, for that is the opposite of ignorant and designing. If the Bible is the work of enlightened and candid men, it is a reliable witness to the innumerable facts which it testifies. The facts are, therefore, true; and consequently, the Bible is the reliable record of divine revelation; because its record embraces the constant testimony of God having spoken the things recorded and done the things described; *e.g.* the crossing of the Red Sea; communications to Moses on Sinai; the resurrection of Christ, &c.

Mr. Bradlaugh says a book in which there are "contradictions on the surface" and admitted "difficulties and obscurities", cannot be a record of divine revelation. This is plausible but not true. The logic of the argument is not apparent unless it be this: "I, Mr. Bradlaugh, have an idea what a divine revelation ought to be, and it is not possible that anything can be a divine revelation which differs from my idea of it. The Bible differs from my idea of what a divine revelation ought to be, therefore, it is not a divine revelation." This would be plain reasoning, but even Mr. Bradlaugh, with all his assurance, would not like to be guilty of it in this form. Yet this is what his argument amounts to. If this is not the argument, there is nothing in it. On what other principle can he contend that the existence of difficulties in the Bible is an evidence of its untruth? The fact of the difficulties in reality works the other way. The Bible does not profess that God has made His way as plain as the shining of the sun. On the contrary, He has concealed wisdom, and made it difficult of attainment, that the intellect of His creatures may be stimulated and developed. Thus we are told to "search for wisdom as for hidden treasure."—(Prov. 2:4). Further, that it is "the glory of God to conceal a thing, and the honour of kings to search out a matter." — (Prov. 25:2). More than once we read, "Here is wisdom: let him that hath understanding" do so and so. The whole Mosaic economy was an

enigma.—(Heb. 9:9; 10:1.) The gospel contained a mystery hid from the beginning.—(Rom. 16:25.) Christ spoke in parables that the scornful ruling class might not understand.—(Mark 4:11-12.) These things are testified in the Scriptures; if, therefore, we are to judge the Scriptures by their own professions, it is a circumstance in their favour that there are “difficulties and obscurities.”

The same principle is observable in nature — the workmanship of the Being who revealed Himself to Moses. The precious metals are hidden: the earth has to be mined to get at them. Valuable results are got at through difficulty. Coal, and gas, and drainage, and useful articles are not come at without skill and labour and patience. We have not obtained the convenience of rail and telegraph without a vast amount of patient application and difficulty. The Bible is in harmony with nature in this respect. We err if we judge it by any theory of our own as to what it ought to be. Our business is to take it as it stands, and adapt ourselves to it wisely as in natural things. To fall out with the Bible because it differs from our idea of what it ought to be, is foolish. We might as well fall out with our own existence because we have to take the trouble to eat, and in most cases to procure our food and do many other things with difficulty.

But Mr. Bradlaugh says the Bible contradicts itself. If this were really so in the serious sense required by Mr. Bradlaugh’s argument, it would doubtless be fatal to the claims of the Bible as a whole. It would not prove that some things in it might not be of God, though contradicted by some things in it that might be of human addition. It would, however, prove that the Scriptures as originally delivered had been corrupted and might therefore raise a difficulty as to which part was to be received with confidence and which rejected. But in point of fact the contradictions alleged by Mr. Bradlaugh do not exist. They are appearances of contradiction merely, which disappear on close investigation. This is no unusual thing in truth. Everyday life makes us familiar with constant illustrations of two apparently opposite statements, being both true and reconcilable. Minds not careful to ascertain truth, can find in every day occurrences abundant materials for captious telling criticism: but it is possible, for the candid mind to steer a safe course through intricacies of an apparently conflicting character, and arrive at the possession of truth. This is the case with the Bible, where appearances of contradiction exist which Mr. Bradlaugh turned to the most advantage.

Mr. Bradlaugh referred to Numbers 23:19; 1 Sam. 15:29, and Matt. 3:6, setting forth

GOD’S IMMUTABILITY.

- 1.—“God is not a man that He should lie, nor the Son of Man that he should repent.”
- 2.—“The strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for He is not a man that He should repent.”
- 3.—“I am the Lord: I change not: therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.”

In juxtaposition with these, he placed 2 Kings 21:1-5; 2 Sam. 24:16; Gen. 6:6, and 1 Sam. 15:11, which he contended were illustrations of

GOD'S CHANGEABLENESS.

- 1.—“Thus saith the Lord, set thine house in order; for thou shalt die and not live . . . I have heard thy prayer . . . I will add unto thy days fifteen years.”
- 2.—“The Lord repented Him of the evil.”
- 3.—“It repented the Lord that he had made man upon the earth.”
- 4.—“It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king.”

And upon these Mr. Bradlaugh argued there was a clear contradiction. But there is none to those who realise that there are two aspects in which God's actions, like man's actions, are to be considered, first in so far as they depend upon Himself, and secondly in so far as they conditionally depend upon the actions of others. The first three texts affirm the steadfastness, in the sense of non-fickleness, of any purpose the Almighty may form, when the stability of that purpose depends upon Himself alone. The last three intimate a change of purpose consequent on a change of the conditions in others upon which the purpose was based. This distinction is actually affirmed in Jer. 18:7, “At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom to pluck up and to pull down, and to destroy it, if that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, *I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them.*” There is no conflict between personal steadfastness of purpose and readiness of adaptation to changed circumstances. The difference between a stable and an unstable man illustrates the point in some degree. The one can always be relied upon under given circumstances; and the other not at all. But the steadiness of the stable man does not consist in a propensity to adhere with mulish pertinacity to plans without reference to their propriety; but in the disposition to steadily follow a certain course of action, so long as that course of action is wise. To continue in the course when circumstances have so altered as to make that course unwise, would be evidence of stupidity and not of stability. To alter the course when the circumstances dictating it have altered, is no evidence of inconstancy or instability. The stability of a wise man shows itself in steadily pursuing one end, and adapting himself to every change in circumstances that might prevent him reaching his aim; like the captain of a vessel who has to shift his sails a hundred times in a voyage, and tack in many different directions to reach the port of destination. The contrast to this would be the man at sea who determined to keep his sails as they were, whatever wind should blow. The first man will be found in a certain port at last, weather permitting; but the other you will never know where to find.

Now, in effect, the declaration of the first three passages concerning God is, that He is more stable than any sea captain that ever put foot on a quarter deck; that His purposes, where they depend only upon Himself, are immovable and unchangeable absolutely; that anything resting on His word is more certain and secure than the everlasting hills; that He is, in His nature, the highest reason and most steadfast of purpose; that the principles upon which He acts are absolutely

unchangeable; that nothing like wanton change or fickleness is possible in Him. But this is not inconsistent with the fact that He adapts Himself to circumstances as they arise in the evolution of His purpose. The human race, in the first instance, turned out differently from His desire. He intended them to be obedient, and was working with them on this basis. They became disobedient, and (after much patience) with the alteration in the conditions upon which the original intention was based, He alters His intention, and gives them up as hopeless. Saul is chosen on the understanding that obedience is the basis of favour. Saul disobeys, and God repents (or changes His mind) with reference to his selection as king. This is not inconsistent with the unchangeability of the principle on which He acts. What would be thought of a stable captain who should allow a mutinous officer to continue in his place? The captain would put him in irons, and would not, thereby, sacrifice his character for stability, but contrariwise would establish it.

When it is seen that the first set of passages have (as the context will show) reference to God's sovereign purpose, while the second set refers to intention dependent upon the condition of others, the appearance of "contradiction" disappears.

Next with regard to the character of God, Mr. Bradlaugh refers to Exod. 32:7, 14, and asks whether we are there to find a divine representation of it: "Let me alone that my wrath may wax hot against them (Israel) that I may consume them." This is addressed to Moses, who was interceding with God for Israel, who had grievously offended in turning to idolatry while Moses was in Sinai. Mr. Bradlaugh would contrast it with the New Testament declaration, "God is love", and contend there was a contradiction; but there is no force in the argument, unless it can be shown that two qualities or attributes cannot co-exist in the same character. Mr. Bradlaugh himself would not pretend that this can be shown. It is a matter of everyday experience that a benevolent man may be capable of great anger if circumstances call for it. Mr. Bradlaugh may say, "But God is not a man." True; but we can reason from the small to the great. If created man is capable of both love and anger without inconsistency, there can be no true objection to the Bible representation of God in both aspects. It is expressly testified (and in the New Testament too) not only that He is love, but that "He is a consuming fire" (Heb. 12:29); where also (10:31) it is said "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." If we are to judge of the consistency of the Bible revelation of God, we must take all parts of it, and not leave out one or elevate one at the expense of another. The philosopher (who after all is a very ignorant person as regards the primary force of the universe) may smile at the idea of God being capable of anger, but he can show no reason against it. Nature, of which he can give no account, except that it is, shows destructive forces and performs destructive operations, and what objection can there be to the analogue of this existing in the first cause? The creator of the eye can presumably see; and the creator of the impulse of anger can presumably show it in a higher form than

we know it. There is no inconsistency in the revelation of the divine character. If anger is shown, it is never without a cause, and the cause is always to be found in things that frustrate the objects of love. Divine love without divine energy to destroy things that would work against it, would be a weak and incomplete character. There is perfect symmetry in the divine character when all its parts are taken in. But, of course, if you disconnect manifested wrath from the circumstances that evoke it, and from the ultimate objects which its manifestation proposes, you exhibit an unintelligible and ugly thing. By a similar treatment of the modest man's anger, it would be possible to show him a tyrant. But this is neither a skilful nor a faithful treatment of the subject. God angry with sin is not an ugly but a beautiful picture, when seen in connection with the evil results of sin and the perfection of divine love, where the divine wisdom and authority are accepted as a law of action.

But there is another consideration to be taken into account with the transaction at Sinai, which becomes specially appropriate in looking at another of the alleged contradictions, viz., the statement that Moses and the elders of Israel saw God (Ex. 24:9-11), and the statement in John 1:18, that "No man hath seen God at any time". The consideration is that the term God does not always mean the Creator *in propria personae*. While the Pentateuch tells us that God spoke to Moses at the bush, it explains that the medium of communication was an angel (Exodus 3:2, 6), which is supported by the New Testament.—(Acts 7:30.) It records that Jacob saw God face to face, yet the actual personage seen was an angel.—(Hosea 12:4.) Jehovah, we are told, rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire, yet the narrative shows the actual operators in the case were angels.—(See Gen. 19; compare the following verses—1, 14, 22, 24.) The same thing appears many times; and the case of Moses on Sinai is no exception, for we are expressly informed, in Acts 7:38, that it was an "angel which spoke to Him in the Mount Sinai"; and, in the 53rd verse, that the law was given "by the disposition (or ministration) of angels." In the light of this, there is nothing inconceivable in the proposition that seems to startle Mr. Bradlaugh; the difficulty exists in the want of information, and not in the subject itself. That the name of God should be identified with angels may, at first sight, appear a little confusing; but the difficulty vanishes when we recognise the fact illustrated in Ex. 23:21 ("I send mine angel: obey his voice, for MY NAME is in him"), that angels engaged specially in the service of the Creator bear His name. "They do His commandments, hearkening to the voice of His word."—(Psalm 103:20.) They act as the instruments of His power; but the connection between their acts and His authority is maintained in the use of the singular verb, with (their) plural nominative — a grammatical anomaly, explained by the fact that one power operates through a plurality of agents.

It is another difficulty with those who think with Mr. Bradlaugh, that God should write with His finger (Ex. 24:12; 32:16); but, in view of the fact that angels are actually signified, there is no difficulty. The angels are spirit (Psalm 104:4),

and spirit is taught by the Bible to be the substratum of all substance, pervading all space.—(Psalm 139:7.) What difficulty would there be to an angel possessing control of this permeating energy in tracing with his finger on stone, characters which, in consequence, should be deeply graven there? The accomplishments of electric science should teach us that there are higher possibilities in heaven and earth than even philosophers dream of, and point to higher developments of power and intelligence than it is permitted frail mortals to experience.

Then stress is laid on the so-called discrepancies between the two versions of the Decalogue.—(Ex. 20; Deut.5.) It is usual to speak as if the existence of the differences constituted a difficulty in the way of receiving either, but much attention to the matter is not needed to perceive the fallacy of the suggestion. If there were even serious differences between the two accounts, they would not, in the presence of all the evidence, disprove that God gave the law from Sinai; for while one account (that of Exodus) is, so to speak, the official and exact record of what transpired at Sinai, the other is part of an historical *resume* orally delivered by Moses forty years afterwards, in which correctness of fact was of more concern than exactness of words. Verbal variations between such a rehearsal and the original deliverance are natural; but the variations are slight indeed; much more so than might have been expected. The language, in both cases, is nearly identical throughout, and the meaning absolutely so, except that, in the rehearsal in the plains of Moab, Moses supplemented the fourth commandment with a retrospective explanation of its reasons, and omits the reference to the creation contained in the original. The variations are confirmatory of the historical reality of the matter, for the one is evidently no copy of the other, but both independent accounts, written at two different times; and that, under such circumstances, they should be so alike in substance is evidence that they both refer to a matter of historic occurrence. Those, therefore, speak otherwise than as scholars who talk of “perplexity (on the part of believers) in having to defend two opposing accounts.” The two accounts are not “opposing”, but mutually confirmatory; and there is no perplexity in the maintenance of both when this is done on Bible ground simply, apart from the theories of inspiration which belong to the clerical thought merely. The Spirit, doubtless, guided Moses in the record, but the guidance had reference more to substance than to form. The Scriptures never show us the preternatural brought to bear where the natural is sufficient.

It is put forward by the same class as an implied impossibility, that God should “issue a complete ethical code which contains nothing about the love of God or the love of man, nothing about public or private worship or prayer; nothing about trust in God or gratitude towards Him; nothing about such virtues as generosity, gratitude, prudence, temperance, fortitude, activity, nor thoughtfulness, which offers a reward to virtue, but not an eternal reward; and not the reward of God’s blessing and a good conscience, but longevity in one narrative, and in the other, prolonged residence in Judea.” This is very specious; but the fallacy of it is

apparent when a demand is made for the authority for assuming that the Bible puts forth the Mosaic law or any part of it as "a complete ethical code." The Bible does the very opposite. It declares the law to have been provisional, partial and imperfect, adapted only to the transition period for which it was given. Paul, discussing this very point, discourses thus: "God gave the inheritance to Abraham by promise . . . Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added, because of transgression, till the seed should come . . . The law was our schoolmaster [a teacher of first lessons] unto Christ . . . after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." — (Gal. 3:19, 24, 25.) The law he further styles a "shadow of good things to come" (Heb. 11:1); and that it made nothing perfect (7:19). There is a good deal of evidence on this point; but it is perhaps unnecessary to quote more than the following: "If the first covenant (the law) had been faultless, then had no place been sought for the second."—(Heb. 8:7.) Mr. Bradlaugh may object to this teaching of Paul's, but he ought, at all events, to see that it is a false assumption that the law, or any part of it, is put forward by the Bible as "a complete ethical code."

It was a system of things which was never intended as a complete development of the divine will, but adapted to the special exigencies of a time of crudeness and transition. For these times its adaptation was admirable. Its immeasurable superiority is realised when contrasted with the contemporary mortals of Egypt and Chaldea, or (later) of Greece and Rome. It is not doing justice to the subject to judge of the Mosaic system of things in the light of the larger illumination that has since come from the same source. Granted that it had nothing to do with "eternal rewards", a reason might be given for this which would startle sceptics, and that is, that eternal rewards of the clerical order are fictions of Paganism. This answer can be substantiated. Disembodied destinies are unknown to the teaching of Christ and Moses. The Bible treats immortality as a something extraneous to human nature, and to be realised (in a limited number of cases only) by resurrection at Christ's reappearance on the earth. The immortality of the soul is not mentioned in either the Old or New Testaments. It is foreign to the teaching of both, as much as it is opposed to philosophical truth of the Huxley order.

Then Mr. Bradlaugh said something about the Bible being opposed to science. He did not elaborate this objection. Presumably his reference was to the notion that the Bible "teaches that the universe was created in six days, six thousand years ago." This is not a correct representation of what is involved in a reception of the Mosaic account. "Heaven and earth" of Genesis is not synonymous with "the universe". Heaven is described as "the firmament", formed "to divide the waters that are above the firmament from the waters that were under it." It is, therefore, the body of atmosphere encircling the globe, whose existence was thus Mosaicly made known ages before it was philosophically ascertained. The testimony is, that heaven and earth, in this limited sense, were the subject, six thousand years ago, of a process called "create". But does this create (*bara*) express the theological idea

of being “made out of nothing”? By no means, for such an idea is foreign to the Bible. The teaching on this point is, that all things were formed “out of God.”—(Rom. 11:36; Cor. 8:6), and the Hebrew verb *bara*, translated “create”, signifies to make, in the sense of constitute, arrange, set in order. It is used periphrastically with “*formed* the earth to be inhabited” in Isa. 45:18. It is translated “made” in the following instances: Psalm 47:48; Num. 16:30; “done”, in Ex. 34:10; “choose”, in Ezek. 21:17; “make fat”, in Samuel 2:29; in other places, “create”. That Moses does not teach the *creation* of the earth in the ordinary sense, six thousand years ago, is proved by his recognition of a pre-“creation” existence. Before the six days’ work began, he speaks of the earth as being “without form and void”, and “darkness on the face of the deep”.—(Gen. 1:2.) How long it had been in this state is not hinted; but the narrative leaves room for the measureless ages said to be required by geology. Neither was the human the first rational race on its surface, if we are to attach the same sense to the words addressed to Adam as they possessed when addressed to Noah: “Be fruitful and multiply, and *replenish* (fill again) the earth.” There may have been a previous race, swept away after the manner of the flood, the catastrophe leaving the earth in the state in which the six days’ work found it. Jude and Peter both refer to pre-Adamite occurrences in this direction.—(2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6.) The work occupying the six days was the work of reclaiming the world from pre-Adamite chaos, with which there is nothing inconsistent in the “historical, critical, and scientific books”, to which it is usual to make such reverential allusion.

“That because God then rested, the last day of the week is to be observed as a day of absolute idleness” is usually a difficulty brought forward by the sceptical objector. That he should stumble at it with orthodox views of divine operations, is no matter of marvel. The difficulty is not incidental to the subject itself. The “Elohim”, the angels of Almighty power, carrying out the mandates of Omnipotence in the re-organisation of the world, must have expended vast energies in the enormous physical achievements of the six days; and although their endowment with these energies must be correspondingly vast, there is nothing inconceivable in their finding the seventh day’s cessation a source of refreshment. The Creator only is unlimited in His power. The idea may be startling to clerical minds, but it belongs to the Bible, and is the explanation of what strikes him in this item as inexplicable.

In Genesis 1 light appears on the scene before the sun. This is made a difficulty needlessly. If all light came from the sun, it might be a difficulty; but there are many sources of light besides the sun. Witness the phosphorescent glow of the ocean at night. There is light in the rocks. A blow with a steel instrument will manifest a spark of it. Light is latent everywhere. It requires but all-controlling Power to be brought to bear to make it manifest; and this was what took place in the present instance. The Spirit of God, which is in itself the light of all light, brooding on the face of the waters, illumined the darkness covering the face of the

deep. But it is said, What need for this mode of light, seeing the sun was in the heavens, where it had been for countless ages? Answer: there are conditions of the atmosphere which prevent the light of the sun from coming through. An unusually dense storm-cloud will darken the air at noon. Now, it is evident that when the Mosaic six days' works of re-organisation began, the globe was enwrapped in watery vapours; for we read in verse 7 of a separation taking place between the light and the heavy elements of the vaporous mantle, the condensed water descending and the vapour ascending to the cloud region of the atmosphere. Before this took place, the vaporous covering of the earth would effectually prevent the light of the sun from reaching it, and cause that state of darkness which was first dispelled by Spirit-caused light.

Verses 16 and 17, speak as if the sun, moon and stars were then made for the first time. But the narrative was written for man as an inhabitant of the earth. We must therefore, read it from the terrestrial and not the astronomical stand-point. From this point of view the sun, moon, and stars would come into existence at this time; for previous to the fourth day, they would not be visible from the earth, on account of the condition of the atmosphere previously referred to; and, therefore, practically, they did not exist in relation to the earth. It is not the modes of the divine procedure that are made the subject of narrative, but the practical results in relation to us. Yet the narrative is consistent with the modes, though the modes are not made visible. God made two great lights, &c.; true: in this there is nothing as to how long He took to make them. Having made them, He placed them (or caused them to appear) in the terrestrial firmament on the fourth day. Thus the narrative suits the proximate aspect of the case, as it would have appeared to a man witnessing the evolutions of the six days, and at the same time, is not in conflict with the mightier phase in which they are to be contemplated through the medium of astronomical science.

There is palpable fallacy in Mr. Bradlaugh's method of construing evidence when it bears on divine things. Called upon to define the principle upon which he believes in the existence and productions of ancient secular writers, he says: "On matters of ordinary occurrence, I accept the best experience of the best men, as I find it fairly recorded, and upon that canon of evidence, I can prove all reasonable historic events." But when matters of extraordinary occurrence are in question, then he says "the experience does not apply." The fallacy here is that Mr. Bradlaugh sets up ordinary experience as the standard of what is "reasonable" and possible. If we accept testimony to things we know to be possible, it is not because of the nature of the things testified, but because of the reliability of the testimony proved in various ways before we accept it. Therefore, we should act illogically if we rejected the same testimony to an event out of the channel of our experience, merely on the ground that the event is out of the experience, for that

would be the mere opposition of ignorance to knowledge. For example: a European banished a hundred years ago, to a foreign island, cut off from all communication with the civilised world, has descendants who never heard of the electric telegraph. Mr. Bradlaugh visits them and tells them a message can be sent invisibly across three thousand miles of ocean in five minutes, and that when it arrives, it is not the paper written by the sender. They say he is fooling them. He earnestly declares it is true, and says he has witnessed the performance. They say it cannot be. Mr. Bradlaugh fetches men from the ship that has brought him to the island. They confirm his representation, and declare they also have seen the telegraph at work, and have themselves received messages from long distances in a few minutes, although the messages were invisible in the transmission. If they act on Mr. Bradlaugh's principle, the islanders will say the law of evidence does not apply in such a case, and those who give such evidence must be mistaken, because they declare a thing of "extraordinary occurrence", and inconsistent with their "experience". They would say, "If it had been a matter of ordinary occurrence", such as the sending of a letter under the wing of a bird, or shooting a message on an arrow, or darting a swift canoe across the water — anything in harmony with their "experience" — they could have received the testimony of Mr. Bradlaugh and his company; but "when you give us an extraordinary occurrence — of a message going and not going — seen when you get it, and not seen when it is coming — that crosses the ocean and yet does not take time to cross — it is then, say they, that the canon of evidence does not apply."

Mr. Bradlaugh would be amused at the simplicity and conceit of the islanders. Their presumption also would strike him, in setting up their limited island experience as the measure of what is possible in the great world of civilisation. Yet this is the position which he himself takes up in relation to the testimony of the apostles. He does not deny that their testimony is given; he does not deny that it is honest and capable testimony; but he won't receive it because the testimony affirms the resurrection of Christ, which is "contrary to his experience". By the ordinary "canon of evidence" the authenticity of the Bible is proved; but because it testifies "extraordinary occurrences", therefore, says Mr. Bradlaugh, "the ordinary canon does not apply!" The reasoning is utterly fallacious and perverse. It ought to go the other way round. Mr. Bradlaugh ought to say, "This testimony is authenticated in too many ways for me to deny it. Therefore, although the testimony affirms something outside of the channel of my experience, it must be true; and I am ignorant of many things that are possible."

"But" says Mr. Bradlaugh, "this book tells me of a man who had no father." In this Mr. Bradlaugh is mistaken. It tells us of Jesus, who had no human father, but who had a father in the Creator, whose son he thereby became.—(Luke 1:35.) Surely Mr. Bradlaugh would not deny the possibility of the Power that produced the first man without human instrumentality, producing a second without human instrumentality.

“It tells me”, says Mr. Bradlaugh, “of a man who was in the grave when he was out of it, and who was seen by one woman, who is two women, who are more than three women.” This is a misrepresentation. Jesus was in the grave three days and three nights, as was shown to Mr. Bradlaugh in his last questioning of Mr. Roberts: and he was seen by one, by two, by three, and by more women, on the morning he rose from the dead. The evidence on the point is perfectly consistent, though varied in the form of its presentation, as was fully shown on the fifth night of the discussion.

“*It tells me that Christ’s mother’s husband had two fathers.*” It does not, Mr. Bradlaugh. It gives you two genealogical lines — one Joseph’s and the other Mary’s, but both nominally terminating in Joseph, as the Jewish custom required; because Mary, by marriage, had become one with him.

“*It tells me Christ lived at the same time in Judaea and Egypt.*” It does not, Mr. Bradlaugh. There is an omission of mention in Luke’s narrative of the visit to Egypt, but that narrative is elliptical enough to allow of the insertion of Matthew’s, though, at the first sight, the two are irreconcilable.

“*It tells me that Christ was known to John and not known to him at the same moment of time.*” This is not so. John the Baptist knew Jesus as his righteous cousin, but not as the Messiah. His ignorance of his Messiahship may appear marvellous in the light we now possess; but it is otherwise when we remember the circumstances preceding Christ’s baptism in the Jordan. John “was in the desert until the day of his showing to Israel”.—(Luke 1:80.) He was brought up there from childhood. He was secluded from sources of information with regard to Jesus; and those sources, even if they had been accessible, were very scanty. The knowledge of Christ’s exact origin and character was known in an express form only to Joseph and Mary, who were reticent on the subject (Luke 2:33, 51), and to Elizabeth, John’s mother, who being old, must have died soon after John’s birth. By the time John was come to discretion, the matter had quieted down. Christ’s boyhood and manhood, till thirty, were undistinguished by the supernatural. There was nothing to manifest his Messiahship. His unblemished character was known to John, but not his identity with the coming one. It had been revealed to John, that on whomsoever, in the act of baptism, the Holy Spirit should descend, that same was the Messiah; and on this his attention was fixed. Hence, his declaration, to which Mr. Bradlaugh’s objection has reference: “I knew him not; but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.”—(John 1:33.)

Then Mr. Bradlaugh wants to know if the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is consistent with the omniscience or goodness of God. On the first point, he points out that “God is represented as saying that the report has reached Him about

Sodom and Gomorrah, and that He is going down to enquire, and will know.” The objection may be presumed to be expressed in the question, “If God is everywhere present, why did he want to come down to know?” In answer to this, it is sufficient to refer to what is written a few pages back (page 200), on the subject of angels and the use of the term “God”, in describing their instrumental relation to things done by them in obedience to the Creator’s mandate. What is there written furnishes the explanation to this objection. God in the case was the angels, undoubtedly, as anyone will see who will take the trouble to peruse the narrative, *e.g.*, Gen. 19:1: “And there came two angels to Sodom at even.” Though the Creator is omniscient, it does not follow the angels are. Peter (1 Pet. 1:12) hints in a contrary direction in saying, “Which things the angels desire to look into”. The fact that the angels “do the commandments” (Psalm 103:20) is evidence of their limitation. Consequently, Mr. Bradlaugh’s objection is founded on misapprehension. These remarks apply in other cases where Mr. Bradlaugh raises a similar objection.

As to his objection to the destruction of Sodom on the score of goodness, remarks already written on page 287 supply the answer. The destruction of the wicked, so far from being inconsistent with goodness, is a part of it. The eternal toleration of evil would be the frustration of eternal goodness. The wicked are useful in their place, their existence supplying one of the conditions of the probation of the opposite class; but goodness requires their final destruction. Consequently, the destruction of the Sodomites proves the very thing that Mr. Bradlaugh quotes it to disprove. The same remark applies to the deluge.

Mr. Bradlaugh’s allusion to the Garden of Eden as “a damnation trap in which to catch the whole human race, so that God might punish them”, is mere clap trap, or a trap to catch the claps of his shallow and ribald supporters. Even with the Calvinistic theory of pre-destinated eternal hell-fire for tormented millions in view, such a description of a matter only possibly involving important truth, is utterly reprehensible. But when directed against the Bible account of the matter, it is the rave of insanity. Adam was simply placed under a higher will than his own, and taught that submission to that will was imperative, and that revolt against it was so serious that nothing short of death would be the consequence. Mr. Bradlaugh may deny the existence of that superior will, but he cannot deny that the Bible theory of the fall, to which only his criticism can apply, involves it, and that therefore the matter is to be considered and judged on the theory of its existence. Looking at it in this way, the transaction of Eden certainly appears in a different light from that in which Mr. Bradlaugh’s coarse description would make it appear. Subjection to God is the highest condition of human well being. It is the necessity of his nature when his nature is fully developed in all its faculties. It is also an element in divine pleasure and a prerogative of the divine right. Consequently an arrangement that brought that subjection visibly and consciously to bear on Adam, so far from being “monstrous”, appears in the light of kindness and wisdom, whether in relation to God or man. The representation of the

appointment of such an arrangement is in fact one of many proofs of the divinity of the Scriptures. A human conception of the beginning of things would certainly have represented man as free to do what he liked and as he liked. God's authority to which the human mind is naturally averse would not have been brought to bear at the very start of human existence in a humanly-invented version of the facts. Adam did not submit implicitly to the law in which divine authority embodied itself: consequently, there came on him, and therefore on his descendants who inherit his being, the consequences belonging to rebellion. Even had the transaction stopped here, there would have been no room for Mr. Bradlaugh's objection: for surely if a military officer may in Mr. Bradlaugh's estimation, legitimately shoot an insubordinate soldier, he cannot deny the Creator's right to deal as he likes with a disobedient creature. But we have to take the sequel into account. That sequel shows God making use of the evil result of the fall, as a means of developing at last the highest good on earth. Doubtless, the understanding of the truth is necessary to qualify a man to see this; and as Mr. Bradlaugh does not possess this understanding, he is not competent to judge the matter which he so harshly condemns. In any system of truth, a man must understand the system as a whole before he is qualified to rightly estimate any part of it in detail. This is peculiarly and emphatically true of the Bible as a whole. With regard to the "story of the fall" in the way Mr. Bradlaugh puts it, Mr. Bradlaugh can only succeed with those who are ignorant of the Bible. He and his disciples may know something of the trashy writers of ecclesiastical antiquity, and perhaps something of the ever-changing speculations of crude superficial scientists; but a man must be ignorant of the Bible or morally incapable of appreciating its system of teaching, who speaks of the garden of Eden as a "damnation trap".

Mr. Bradlaugh made some smart observations on the case of Jacob and Esau; but the smartness was in the way of marshalling his words, rather than in justly or logically treating the facts as they stand. He declared Jacob to be a rascal, a liar, a robber, a cheat, and asked whether God loved Jacob because of these things or in spite of them. He omitted to show that Jacob was all these. He referred to certain recorded incidents, but these do not prove his contention. A liar is a man who is in the habit of lying: a rascal is a man who is in the habit of defrauding. A man's character is not to be described by isolated acts or incidents. A man may in the main be very different from some act in particular he has committed. Jacob's character in the main was such as to please God. In certain transactions he acted with human weakness. The record of the weakness is evidence of the genuineness of the record, for an invented history of Jacob would have suppressed them. Jacob was a "plain man dwelling in tents." He was docile and God-fearing, while Esau was a wild roving man, cognising the facts of nature merely as an animal does, without any recognition of the contriver and proprietor of nature. This constitutes the difference between men whom God is pleased with and those He is not pleased with. So it is revealed: "To this man will I look, who is humble and of

a contrite heart, and who trembleth at my word.” Mr. Bradlaugh may despise the fact; but it is not in his power, either to show it is not the fact or why it should not be the fact. Wise men are content with facts, whatever speculative theory they may have formed as to what things ought to be. The fact in this case is that the God of the Bible has declared He is pleased with those men who appreciate him, and will forgive their iniquities. The case of Jacob is an illustration of this revealed fact, instead of being a contradiction to it. And so also is the case of David on which Mr. Bradlaugh harped so much. He was emphatically “a man after God’s own heart”. Mr. Bradlaugh asks how could this be when he was a murderer and adulterer, and died with vindictive words in his mouth towards Shimei, Joab, and others. A “man after God’s own heart” is a man who answers to the definition given by God Himself: “To this man will I look, to him that is poor and of contrite spirit, and *trembleth at my words*.”—(Isaiah 56:2.) David answered exactly to this description. God’s word in anything commanded his profoundest reverence and regard; and when convinced of wrong-doing, he was penitent to the utmost abasement. He would not sanction the killing of Saul by Abishai, because Saul was the Lord’s anointed.—(1 Sam. 26:9-11.) He made instant confession and reparation in the matter of Uriah the Hittite. Towards God he was “as a little child”, while, towards man, he was “a mighty man of valour”. When he sinned, he confessed and forsook his sins. Thus he was a man after God’s own heart. In considering his directions to Solomon concerning Shimei, Joab, &c., it must be remembered that David sat in the seat of judgment for God, and that the men in question had sinned against God in the several matters of their offence. If David had been personally vindictive, he would not have spared them as he did. As absolute monarch of Israel, under God, he had the power to take away their lives, which he would have done if characterised by the disposition suggested in the objection. Instead of that, he allowed them to live so long as he himself was alive, but left the judicial punishment of their crimes to the wisdom of Solomon.

This exhausts the scriptural difficulties referred to by Mr. Bradlaugh on the first night. He referred to them several times during the other nights, so that there will be the less to answer in the review of those nights.

Two other points will conclude this notice of the first night. Mr. Bradlaugh expressed surprise that Mr. Roberts should have assumed the admissibility of certain evidence in the debate, instead of coming prepared to prove it, link by link. “His business is”, said Mr. Bradlaugh, “to prove as he goes on”, which, of course, sounded very reasonable, but which, as Mr. Bradlaugh applied the axiom was very unreasonable. The thing he asked Mr. Roberts to do would have taken all the time in the doing, and would have left the real argument out in the cold. And it was perfectly unnecessary to do it. Everybody knows of the existence and authenticity of the books he asked Mr. Roberts to prove. The abundance of early

forgeries does not interfere with this fact. He might as well have asked proof of the fact that King James' English Version of the Bible was a translation of the original. But, of course, Mr. Bradlaugh's cue was to entangle the debate with extraneous matters, like a counsel in a bad case, who harasses his opponent with technical objections, and keeps as long away from the merit as possible. On this principle, doubtless, he also tried to make the differences between the Hebrew Scriptures and the Septuagint to appear much more serious than they are. The mere alteration of numerals he put forward as indicating extensive and radical dissimilarity, which does not exist. The Septuagint is the substantial counterpart in Greek of the Hebrew Scriptures; but, of course, it was Mr. Bradlaugh's aim to hide this as much as possible.

SECOND NIGHT

MR. ROBERTS' ARGUMENT

THE argument on this evening, taking the three speeches and the questions together, was more complete than the argument on the first night. In brief it amounted to this: There is no question that Christ was crucified. There is no question that his disciples afterwards preached his resurrection. How came they to do so, and how came thousands of those who had crucified him to believe? If Christ rose, there is an explanation. If Christ did not rise, the apostles declared what they knew to be false, and must have had a motive in doing so. What motive could they have? It brought them into collision with Jew and Pagan, and exposed them to incessant disadvantage. The only other alternative is: they may have sincerely believed that Christ rose though he never did; but this alternative is inconsistent with the facts. When he rose they did not believe it. All this shows there was no predisposition to entertain a fantasy on the subject. What, then, led them to believe and preach the resurrection of Christ? The reason given for the change is a reasonable account of the change: Christ appeared to them, spoke to them, ate with them, asked them to handle him, stayed with them six weeks, and finally sent power to work miracles upon them. If this occurred there is an explanation of the great fact that a few poor men, whose doctrine was that they should not resist their enemies, succeeded in subverting Judaism and Paganism in the teeth of the organised opposition of both, and the effect of whose work is a fact of the present moment, inwrought with the life of all civilised nations, evidenced in every legal document which has to state in what "*year of our Lord*" the matter originates. The New Testament account exhibits a cause adequate to the establishment of that system in the world. If that is denied, we have an effect for which no efficient cause is shown.

MR. BRADLAUGH'S ARGUMENT.

The only attempt Mr. Bradlaugh made to answer this was a loose allusion to the Mahommedans and Buddhists. "I do not dispute the existence of the Mahommedans, said he, but I should be very sorry to accept that as a proof of the authenticity and divinity of the Koran." The cases are not parallel; and Mr. Bradlaugh's assumption that they are, shows either that he did not understand, or that he chose to ignore his opponent's argument.

The existence of the Mahommedans is a proof of effectual means having been taken to establish Mahommedanism in the world. We examine the facts, and we see the nature and operation of these means at once. As has been truly said, Mahomet took the way to succeed. He gave his followers a commission to exterminate the infidel, and offered life and protection to everyone who should embrace Islamism. The system is embodied in the Koran. This Koran is in the hands of millions of Mahommedans in the present day, which proves it to be Mahomet's work, for no other than Mahomet's work could have obtained currency among their succeeding generations. Thus the existence of the Mahommedans with the Koran in their hands is a proof of the authenticity of the Koran; and an examination of their history and their documents explains their rise and success, and proves them not divine, for Mahomet in the Koran admits the divinity of Abraham, the prophets and Christ, and thereby destroys his own claim, even if there were no other disproof; for the divinity of Christ excludes the divinity of any other "prophet, priest and king", which Mahomet was probably unaware of.

The argument of Mr. Bradlaugh's opponent was that when the history and literature of Christianity are examined in the same way, its divinity follows as a logical result. The present existence of professing Christians is only the first step in the argument. It is a great fact, calling for explanation. The explanation is contained in the book in the hands of Christians, the authenticity of which is proved exactly in the same way as the Koran (only that there is a large amount of collateral evidence, which is wanting in the case of the Koran). No other than the genuine writings of the apostles could have obtained universal currency among Christians at the start, and none but the writings universally current at the start could have obtained universal circulation among the succeeding generations, from which it follows that the book now in the hands of universal Christendom is the authentic work of the apostles. The testimony of early and doubtful Christian writers can be dispensed with in this argument. When, in the next place, we come to look at the facts connected with the rise and progress of the system established by them, we have no such explanation as exists in the case of Mahommedanism. While Mahomet took the way to succeed, Christ took the way to fail if no miracle was employed; for he prohibited his disciples from using the sword, and taught them to eschew in every form the physical resistance of their enemies. As a matter

of fact, they did not resist, but fled from persecution, and suffered themselves, when caught, to be slain in large numbers. The State authorities employed their whole power against them; yet in spite of this, they finally planted Christianity in the world on the ruins of Paganism. Now, as a mere matter of common reason, there must have been a cause equal to this success. It cannot be found in the nature of the principles inculcated, for these are opposed to the natural tendencies of human nature. But it is found in that which they allege in their writings to have been the cause:—their testimony that Christ rose from the dead, and endowed them with supernatural gifts in attestation of their testimony. The first fact explains the constancy of the apostles, during years of suffering for their testimony. The second fact explains the great and widespread conviction produced by the testimony. Take away these facts, and there is no rational explanation of an undoubted historic fact, constituting the greatest revolution the world has ever seen.

Mr. Bradlaugh either did not see or evaded the force of this argument. He tried to pooh-pooh it by the general and absurd allusion to Mahomedanism already referred to. In quieter hours, the reader will, perhaps, be able to appreciate it at its true value.

Mr. Bradlaugh tried in the same way to reduce the evidence of Tacitus and Pliny to nothing. He said there was nothing in either of them to prove the authenticity and divinity of the Scriptures. They were not quoted to prove this by themselves, and, therefore, a statement like this does not get rid of them. They were quoted to prove the existence of a widely-scattered and persecuted community of Christians at the end of the first and beginning of the second centuries; and this they do prove most conclusively. And the proving of this establishes one step in the argument by which the authenticity and divinity of the Scriptures is proved. Therefore, the testimony of Tacitus and Pliny is of great importance in its place. Only an indiscriminating or a reckless opponent would assert it to be otherwise.

Mr. Bradlaugh asserted on the second night, and several times subsequently, that there is "tolerable evidence" "that the whole of the sacred books of the Jews were destroyed during the captivity, and had to be re-written". Mr. Bradlaugh made this statement with the view of casting discredit on the Old Testament part of the Bible; but the statement is not true. The testimony of Eusebius to this effect is a mere re-echo of a statement in the Book of Esdras; and though it might be valuable in proving Eusebius' acquaintance with Esdras, and, therefore, of the antiquity of Esdras, if that were called in question, just as his quotations from the New Testament are good evidence of the existence and authenticity of the New Testament as against men like Mr. Bradlaugh, who find it necessary to deny that the New Testament was produced in the first century, it is of no weight whatever in determining the truth of the statement of Esdras. We must consider that statement on its own merits. That the author of the Book of Esdras made the statement is without doubt; and it gives Mr. Bradlaugh a convenient peg on which

to hang the theory that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are the production of Esdras, and not of Moses, and the other various writers to whom they are ascribed. But the merest comparison of any part of the Old Testament with the writings of Esdras is sufficient to convince minds of the most ordinary penetration, that the theory is without foundation. The author of the drivelling inanities of Esdras could never have written the lucid and majestic utterances of Deuteronomy. There is no more in common between Esdras and the Bible than there is between the doggerel rhymester of a village newspaper and the writings of Milton or Shakespeare. If Esdras wrote the books of the Old Testament, Esdras would have imparted his own qualities to them, and Esdras and the Bible would have been manifestly from the same hand. Instead of this, they are as dissimilar as possible. It may be said that Esdras wrote the books of Moses, &c., from memory, and that this would account for the difference between his own productions and the Scriptures of Moses and the prophets. Granted the possibility of an extraordinary verbal memory equal to the feat of reproducing burnt books; but in that case, the proof for the prior existence and authenticity of the books so reproduced would be the same as if they had not been burnt. The only difference would be, that instead of existing with an unbroken continuity in a literary form, they existed, for a short time, in the brain of a man who was thoroughly familiar with them.

But there is positive evidence that the Scriptures were not destroyed at the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. That many copies were destroyed is highly probable, and that many Jewish persons may have supposed that these comprehended every copy is also possible, which may have given rise to the tradition reflected in the pages of Esdras. But there is evidence that this notion, if it existed, was a wrong notion. There were two deportations of captives from Jerusalem before the destruction of that city by Nebuchadnezzar.—(Jer. 52:28-30.) Among them was Daniel, who says of himself: “In the first year of Darius (at the close of the seventy years’ captivity), I, Daniel *understood by books* the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to *Jeremiah the prophet, &c.*”—(Dan. 9:2.) Here is Jeremiah at least in the possession of Daniel seventy years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and before Esdras was written; and if the book of Jeremiah was in his possession, the other Scriptures would be in his possession also; for the reason that would lead him to have one part would lead him to have all. The probability is that he took them with him when carried from Jerusalem amongst other notable captives to Babylon.

Then we have “The Book of the Law of Moses” in the custody of those who returned from the captivity at Babylon. It was read to the congregation on their return to Jerusalem (Nehemiah 13:1), which establishes the conclusion to be inferred from the case of Daniel, that the Scriptures were in safe preservation, in the custody of such as feared God among the captives in Babylon, notwithstanding the destruction that befell the temple and its contents. That such should be the case is most natural, in view of the special duty that devolved on the

priests to take charge of and instruct the people in the holy writings, as has already been shown in the review of the first night.

If it is objected that the evidence is derived from the books said to have been destroyed and re-written by Esdras, it only shows the falsity of that idea all the more forcibly; for had the statement been true, the internal evidence of the books said to have been reproduced, and for such a reason, would have supported and not confuted it. Mr. Bradlaugh is very willing to believe Eusebius when he supposes his statements are damaging to the Scriptures; but, fortunately, there is evidence that Eusebius' borrowed information on this point is incorrect. Finally, even if true, it would not weaken the foundation on which the validity of the Scriptures rests; for Christ endorsed them; and if his resurrection is proved, his endorsement of them would be proof of the authenticity and divinity of the Scriptures, even if they had, at one time, been annihilated, and required to be reproduced by Esdras or anybody else.

THE GOD REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

We next pass to Mr. Bradlaugh's remarks on the God revealed in the Bible. It is, doubtless, true that the Bible reveals "something much clearer than" that He is the "primal creative energy". The statement that He was the primal creative energy was an accommodation to those who ask for God from the merely scientific point of view. It was advanced as a definition at once the simplest and most unassailable by those who deny Him. It was not intended to express all that is revealed of Him; but it does express the primary fact that all things are Grk. ek autos, out of Him (1 Cor. 8:6; Rom. 11:36); that they exist and subsist in Him (Acts 17:28), and that they are sustained by the word of His power, which is universal (Heb. 1:3; Psa. 139:7-12). The definition, however, does not exclude nor conflict with other things that are revealed concerning Him; and those other things are not of the contradictory character which Mr. Bradlaugh's reckless allegation would make them appear. The Bible reveals "a God who is everywhere, and who lives somewhere above", without teaching an anomaly; for its teaching on the subject is that the universal "spirit" and the Father dwelling in heaven are one God (Ps. 139:1-12; 1 Cor. 2:10-11; Matt. 6:4, 9; 10:20). Mr. Bradlaugh and his friends may not be able to comprehend this idea; but it is not altogether inconceivable to those who realise the unity subsisting between the sun and the light of the sun diffused through space — two things absolutely one in nature and connection, and yet capable of being spoken of as two things. If the sun can be in heaven, and people on earth can yet talk of letting the sun in at their windows, it is not necessarily a contradiction to teach that "God lives somewhere above", and is yet everywhere present. The one is a visible fact; the other is an attested fact, though invisible, and this is all the difference as regards their relation to our understanding. They are

both equally inscrutable and both equally reasonable. There is something subtler than light. Scientific men call it "force"; and to this force they ascribe all manifestations of force, light itself included. What it is, they know not and cannot conceive; but its existence is none the less apparent to their understandings. Consequently the Bible, in teaching an universal inscrutable Spirit, teaches no more than we are compelled scientifically to receive; only it adds what science cannot know or find out — that this universal primal force has focal centre in a Supreme Personal Intelligence of tangible glory and form. Such as Mr. Bradlaugh can only say they don't believe it; they cannot disprove it, and they cannot show a reason why it should not be so. No reason can be given for the primary and the absolute. It may as well be one thing as another, so far as our conceptions or inductions are concerned. Our simple duty is to find out what it is and believe. It is for the earnest mind to decide whether the Bible does not reveal it. Mr. Bradlaugh's contradiction does not get rid of it. Its revealing that God is everywhere and yet in heaven, instead of proving the Bible undivine, is an evidence in the other direction; for human reason would not have conceived of a thing so apparently contradictory.

As to its revealing "a God who could be seen and who could not be seen", that is explained by the fact developed early in the review — that while angels, bearing the name of God as His representative to men, were often seen, the Eternal Father Himself is invisible to mortal eye, "dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto."—(1 Tim. 6:16.) So also with its representations of "a God who knew everything and did not know some things": the Eternal Father knows all things: but "the angels who do His commandments, hearkening to the voice of His word", (Psalm 103:20), and who, bearing His name, are sent forth to execute His behests, they do not necessarily know all things. Even the Son of God was limited in his knowledge, (Mark 13:32), though he could say "I and the Father *are one*".—(John 10:30.) Mr. Bradlaugh makes havoc of the general teaching of the Bible from ignorance of the details of what it reveals. He is like a child telling a professor of electrical science that he contradicts himself because he says electricity binds together and rends asunder. There is a well-known saying about certain who rush in where angels fear to tread. The saying is not inapplicable to those who criticise in Mr. Bradlaugh's ferocious and blundering style.

As to the Bible teaching "a God who is unchangeable, continually changing", the charge is not true. It has already been dealt with and it is unnecessary to repeat; we notice it merely to make our review of the second night complete.

Mr. Bradlaugh makes great capital out of the slavery clauses of the Mosaic code. He does this by an illegitimate treatment of the subject only. He makes no allowance for the prerogative of God, as the Proprietor of all things, to dispose of men as He chooses; nor of His right and ability to give laws adapted to such special ends as He might have in view at any particular time. No candid man could be guilty of this mistake. It is expressly declared in Ezekiel that the Mosaic statutes

were designedly otherwise than good. Thus: "Because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes and polluted my sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers' idols, wherefore *I gave them also statutes THAT WERE NOT GOOD* and judgments whereby they should not live."—(Ezekiel 20:24-25.) Peter also speaks of the Mosaic law as "a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear", (Acts 15:10) and Paul describes it as "a ministration of death".—(2 Cor. 3:7.) Mr. Bradlaugh may say it was unreasonable that God should give a law of this defective and oppressive nature, (though such a criticism would be the height of presumption), but he cannot say that the Bible puts it forward as an absolutely good thing in its entirety. Consequently, he is precluded from founding any argument against the Bible on its non-goodness in any particular. The Bible professes it was not good in some of its statutes, and perhaps these included the slave laws on which Mr. Bradlaugh founded his inuendo. The fact that it should declare some of them to be "not good" (and that because of Israel's sin) is another of the many indirect proofs of its divinity; for merely human writers would never have spoken thus of their own law, especially for such a reason.

Mr. Bradlaugh tries to make light of the Septuagint as a witness to the authenticity and reliability of the Hebrew Scriptures. This literary monument is self-evidently a witness of the most valuable kind, notwithstanding the doubts raised by learning. The opponents of the Bible would certainly feel themselves relieved of a great difficulty if the Septuagint ceased to exist. As Mr. Bradlaugh laid stress on the fact that Mr. Roberts did not read the extract from Josephus in support of it, the extract from Josephus is here set forth as follows:

"When Alexander had reigned twelve years, and after him Ptolemy Soter forty years, Philadelphus then took the kingdom of Egypt, and held it forty years within one . . . Demetrius Phalerius, who was library keeper to the king, was now endeavouring, if it were possible, to gather together all the books that were in the habitable earth, and buying whatsoever was anywhere valuable, or agreeable to the king's inclination, (who was very earnestly set upon collecting of books,) to which inclination of his, Demetrius was zealously subservient. And when once Ptolemy asked him how many ten thousands of books he had collected, he replied, that he had already about twenty times ten thousand. But he said he had been informed that there were many books of law among the Jews worthy of inquiring after, and worthy of the king's library, but which, being written in characters and in a dialect of their own, will cause no small pains in getting them translated into the Greek tongue: that the character in which they are written seems to be like that which is the proper character of the Syrians, and that its sound when pronounced, is like to theirs also; and that this sound appears to be peculiar to themselves. Wherefore, he said that nothing hindered why they might not get those books to be translated also; for while nothing is wanting that is necessary for that purpose, we may have their books also in this library. So the king thought that Demetrius was very zealous to procure him abundance of

books, and that he suggested what was exceeding proper for him to do; and therefore he wrote to the Jewish high priest that he should act accordingly . . . Ptolemy wrote, and that in the manner following:—‘King Ptolemy to Eleazar the high priest, sendeth greeting . . . I have determined to procure an interpretation of your law, and to have it translated out of Hebrew into Greek, and to be deposited in my library. Thou wilt therefore do well to choose out and send to me men of a good character, who are now elders in age, and six in number out of every tribe. These by their age, must be skilful in the laws and of abilities to make accurate interpretation of them; and when this shall be finished, I shall think that I have done a work glorious to myself; and I have sent to thee Andreas, the captain of my guard and Aristeus, men whom I have in very great esteem; by whom I have sent those first-fruits which I have dedicated to the temple, and to the sacrifices, and to other uses, to the value of a hundred talents; and if thou wilt send to us, to let us know what thou wouldest have further, thou wilt do a thing acceptable to me.’

“When this epistle of the king was brought to Eleazar, he wrote an answer to it with all the respect possible:—‘Eleazar the high priest to king Ptolemy, sendeth greeting. If thou and thy queen Arisone, and thy children, be well, we are entirely satisfied. When we received thy epistle, we greatly rejoiced at thy intentions; and when the multitude were gathered together we read it to them, and thereby made them sensible of the piety thou hast towards God. We also showed them the twenty vials of gold, and thirty of silver, and the five large basins, and the table for the shew-bread; as also the hundred talents for the sacrifices, and for making what shall be needful at the temple: which things Andreas and Aristeus, those most honourable friends of thine have brought us; and truly they are persons of an excellent character, and of great learning, and worthy of thy virtue. Know then, that we will gratify thee in what is for thy advantage, though we do what we used not to do before; for we ought to make a return for the numerous acts of kindness which thou hast done to our countrymen. We immediately, therefore, offered sacrifices for thee and for thy sister, with thy children and friends; and the multitude made prayers that thy affairs may be to thy mind; and that thy kingdom may be preserved in peace, and that the translation of our law may come to the conclusion thou desirest, and be for thy advantage. We have also chosen six elders out of every tribe, whom we have sent, and the law with them. It will be thy part out of thy piety and justice, to send back the law when it hath been translated; and to return those to us who bring it, in safety.’—Farewell?

“This was the reply which the high priest made; but it does not seem to me to be necessary to set down the names of the seventy (two) elders who were sent by Eleazar, and carried the law, which yet were subjoined at the end of the epistle . . . And when they were come to Alexandria, and Ptolemy heard that they were come, and that the seventy elders were come also, he presently sent for Andreas and Aristeus, his ambassadors, who came to him, and delivered him the

epistle which they brought him from the high priest, and made answers to all the questions he put to them by word of mouth. He then made haste to meet the elders that came from Jerusalem for the interpretation of the laws . . . And when they had gone over the bridge he proceeded to the northern parts, and showed them where they should meet, which was in a house which was built near the shore, and was a quiet place, and fit for their discoursing together about their work. When he had brought them thither, he entreated them (now they had all things about them which they wanted for the interpretation of their law), that they would suffer nothing to interrupt them in their work. Accordingly, they made an accurate interpretation, with great zeal and great pains; and this they continued to do till the ninth hour of the day; after which time they relaxed and took care of their body, while their food was provided for them in great plenty; besides, Dorotheus, at the king's command, brought them a great deal of what was provided for the king himself. But in the morning they came to the court, and saluted Ptolemy, and then went away to their former place, where, when they had washed their hands, and purified themselves, they betook themselves to the interpretation of the laws. Now when the law was transcribed, and the labour of interpretation was over, which came to its conclusion in seventy-two days, Demetrius gathered all the Jews together to the place where the laws were translated and where the interpreters were, and read them over . . . So the king rejoiced when that his design of this nature was brought to perfection to so great advantage, and he was chiefly delighted with hearing the laws read to him and was astonished at the deep wisdom and meaning of the legislator."

So much for Josephus' intelligent account of the origin of the Septuagint. Mr. Bradlaugh's allusion to the Darghestan roll is illustrative of his sense of the value of the Septuagint to the defenders of the Bible; and it also illustrates the facility with which he can lay hold of an utterly worthless argument when the case he is opposing fails to admit of reasonable objection. He says, "There is no Pentateuch roll which can be carried back earlier than the famous Dargheston roll, and that comes nearly 600 years on this side of the Christian era, by the contention of its best men — 580 odd years." This has nothing to do with the question. The question is not as to the age of a particular document, in the antiquarian sense, but the age of the Septuagint as a literary production. Surely our confidence in the authorship of a book does not depend upon the possession of the manuscript he wrote, or any other MS. of a particular age. If it does, how comes Mr. Bradlaugh to receive so implicitly the writings of Philo, on which he founds his preposterous theory of Christianity originating with the Essenes? Philo wrote 1,800 years ago, and, probably, the oldest copy of his works is not a fourth of the age of "the famous Darghestan roll" of the Pentateuch. Yet Mr. Bradlaugh, who receives Philo in the absence of ancient copies, makes it an objection in the case of the Pentateuch, that the oldest copy is more than a thousand years old! This is mere

child's play. The Darghestan roll, the oldest of ancient copies of the Pentateuch, is only the survivor of a family of similar documents, whose origin, in a literary sense, is traceable to the incident recorded by Josephus, who wrote 1,800 years ago.

Mr. Bradlaugh makes some proper remarks on the subject of martyrdom, without, however, weakening the force of the argument arising from the martyrdom of the apostles. "Martyrdom", he says, "is no voucher for the divinity" of the thing for which the martyr suffers death. "There have been martyrs for every heresy." True; but martyrdom is an evidence of sincerity; and this sincerity becomes an important affair to consider when the question involved is a question of fact, in which the sufferer was a personal witness of the fact alleged. If a man suffers death for an opinion, his death is no proof that his opinion was right, but it is a proof he sincerely held it, and may lead thoughtful people to investigate the grounds on which it was held. But the case is different in an instance like the apostles. They suffered persecution not for an opinion, but for declaring they had seen Christ alive after his crucifixion. This was a question of fact. Their suffering death for such a cause is proof that they believed the fact; and the only question left to be investigated is as to whether they were mistaken in their belief. An investigation of this question, conducted on the ordinary principles of evidence, leaves no room for doubt; and the only ground of opposition that can be taken to their testimony is the one that was taken by a gentleman on board the *Aleppo*, who being pressed on this point, admitted that he could not get rid of the evidence of Christ's resurrection, but that he could not receive it, because it testified to a thing that was out of the region of his experience. The absurd nature of this position has already been noticed.

The very circumstance which Mr. Bradlaugh cites in opposition to their testimony is a proof of its reliability. He says: "I will show you that when Jesus was in danger, his disciples ran away, and his most trusty disciple denied him over and over again." It is true that the disciples fled when the officers came to apprehend Jesus, and that Peter denied him three times. Yet all the disciples (and Peter in particular) afterwards bore witness to his resurrection, and suffered for their testimony, as the same account tells us. This leads to two questions, which cannot be reasonably answered without affording proof of the truth of Christ's resurrection. How came men who deserted Christ in the presence of danger, to afterwards brave death by their testimony to his resurrection? Such men must have had a good reason for taking a course which amounted to walking into the jaws of death itself. If Christ rose and appeared to them, there is a reason which explains all. If Christ did not rise, we have the inconceivable phenomena of proved cowards acting the part of heroes on behalf of a lie, and succeeding, without the use of force, in establishing the Christian faith, in the face of armed opposition on the part of the two great religious organizations of the age — Judaism and Paganism. The other question is, How comes the New Testament to

record that "the disciples ran away and his most trusty disciple denied him over and over again?" If the apostolic work was not divine, it was a human work conceived with human objects and established by human means. In that case, the New Testament was written for the purpose of establishing the credit of the apostles and the prestige of their work, from a human point of view. On such a supposition, it is impossible to understand the desertion of the disciples and the unfaithfulness of Peter being placed on record. It is an unknown thing in the history of imposture or fanaticism, that pretenders labouring to establish the credit of an imposture, should publish facts tending to throw discredit on it; least of all, that the leader of the movement should be held up, at one time, as a traitor to the cause, in the very documents intended to establish its reputation! But if Christ rose from the dead, all is explained. We then see that these things are placed on record, first because they happened, and, secondly, because their occurrence was wholesome to be known, both as regarded the apostles themselves, who were liable, in their privileged position to be exalted above measure, and believers in general who might be tempted to regard the apostles as free from human frailty.

Mr. Bradlaugh objects to the statement that both Jew and Gentile admit that the body of Christ could not be found after his crucifixion. He thinks such an assertion reckless, and illustrative of carelessness in the use of words. He challenges the production of any Rabbinical admission to the effect that the body of Christ could not be found. The answer is that this is one of many things which are obviously true without being capable of technical demonstration. There are demonstrations that are more conclusive than technical demonstrations. In this case, we have an illustration. The Jews, to this day, say the disciples of Christ stole the body of Christ, and then raised the report that he had risen. What is this but an admission that the body could not be found? If the body of Christ could have been found, would this story, which dates away back to the very beginning of the "Christian Era", have been invented? On the contrary, would not the body have been produced, to the utter confutation of the apostolic testimony in that and all subsequent times? This question acquires increased force, in view of the fact that the apostles were apprehended and imprisoned by the very council of priests that obtained the crucifixion of Jesus. When the apostles were brought before them as prisoners at the bar, what did the apostles say? "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom YE SLEW AND HANGED ON A TREE. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. And *we are witnesses of these things*, and so is also the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey Him." The apostles accused their judges of being the slayers of Jesus. Their judges, it is added, "were cut to the heart, and took counsel to slay them."—(Acts 5:33.) Now, in such a state of mind, would not their judges have obtained possession of the body of Jesus had it been obtainable, and, by its production, have silenced for ever the intolerable testimony of the disciples, who fled from Christ in the hour of darkness, but were now so bold? The fact that they did not do so is in itself proof that the body of

Christ could not be found, and that they admitted it. This is proof that will be conclusive to most minds, even if Mr. Bradlaugh requires the evidence of "Rabbinical writings" for it, which even if produced, would be scouted by him as freely as other more unimpeachable writings were.

THIRD NIGHT.

MR. ROBERTS' ARGUMENT.

THE argument on Paul's case was fairly developed. It lacked entire fulness, however, owing to the absence of some things which time did not admit the introduction of. This applies to both arguments used and to arguments not used. As to the arguments used, they might be made fuller and richer and stronger: but the length to which the review has already gone compels us to be content to allow them to go as they are.

The arguments not used were those which go to show the impossibility of Paul's case being explained on any hypothesis except the one that he was a true man. And these can only now be indicated in a brief manner. For their full elucidation, the reader is referred to Lord Lyttelton's treatise on the case of Paul. Mr. Roberts intended to submit had time admitted, that Paul was either,

- 1.—An impostor who declared what he knew to be untrue for selfish ends.
- 2.—A self-deceived enthusiast.
- 3.—An enthusiast deceived by others, or
- 4.—A true man undeceived by himself or others, who related what actually occurred, to whom Christ actually appeared, who really wrought miracles, and who is therefore a true witness of the resurrection of Christ, and therefore of the divinity of the Scriptures.

Paul must have been one of these four. Taking them one by one, it was intended to be argued—

1.—That he could not have been an impostor, aiming by falsehood at selfish ends, because, as a matter of fact, his testimony cost him everything dear to man: fortune, friends, reputation, and at last life itself (Phil. 3:8, "For whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ"; also see 1 Cor. 4:9-13). Also, because his demeanour is inconsistent with the character of an impostor, as illustrated by his life as recorded by Luke in the Acts, of which this is a fair specimen: "And as we tarried there (at Caesarea) many days, there came down from Judea a certain prophet named Agabus. And when he was

come unto us, he took Paul's girdle and bound his own hands and feet and said, Thus saith the Holy Spirit, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hand of the Gentiles. And when we heard these things, both we and they of that place besought him not to go up to Jerusalem. Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? For I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done."—(Acts 21:10-14.) Anyone who can imagine an impostor enacting this part has no acquaintance with human nature. Again, take the speech which Paul addressed to the elders of the Ephesian Church at Miletus, on the occasion of parting from them for the last time: "Ye know that from the first day I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind and many tears and temptations which befell me by lying in wait of the Jews. And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there, save that the Holy Spirit witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God." . . . "I have coveted no man's silver or gold or apparel. Yea; ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have showed you all things how that so labouring, ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus: how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."—(Acts 20:18-24; 33-35.) These are not the words of an impostor. Neither were Paul's doctrines by possibility the doctrines of an impostor. For a fair example of them, the 2nd chapter of his epistle to Titus may be read.

It was then intended to be argued that he could not have been a self-deceived enthusiast (that is, a man victimised by a feverish mental illusion, which impelled him, in a state of semi-madness to declare things that he thought true, but which were not true). 1, Because the convictions he entertained were not such as the laws of hallucination would have predisposed him to entertain, if he were of that temperament. The conviction that a crucified claimant of the Messiahship was really the Christ, was opposed to his education as a Jew and a Pharisee, and opposed to his natural bent as a combative and energetic upholder of the law of Moses. His education as a Jew would implant the view that the Messiah, when he appeared, would be immortal, and that therefore, Jesus, as having been crucified, could not be he; while, on the other hand, his conviction that the law of Moses was divine, and his ardent desire to signalise himself in its defence, would incline him strongly to set himself against a doctrine that a crucified Christ was the end of the law. To oppose the apostles would naturally appear to such a man to be doing

God service. Hallucination in a case like Paul's, according to the law of that disease, would have taken a form in harmony with these Judaic proclivities. The vision seen as the result of hallucination would have been a vision instructing him to extirpate the Christians and championize the cause of Judaism throughout the world. Instead of that he was arrested in the very act of giving effect to all his cherished convictions. On an expedition to destroy the Christians, he saw something which went directly in the teeth of his education — something that was in direct opposition to his purpose, and which diverted his whole energy into the very opposite channel, becoming a preacher of the faith which formerly he destroyed. 2, The nature of the work to which he set himself was not what a self-deceived enthusiast would have undertaken, and certainly one he would not have succeeded in. He sought to turn the pagans from idolatry, the Jews from their stereotyped and lifeless Judaism, and all men from sin, with the object in all cases "that they might receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance", in a kingdom to be set up by Christ at his return. In the execution of this work, he showed none of the egotism of an enthusiast. He did not seek to bring attention to himself. On the contrary, he objected to those among the Corinthians who said "I am of Paul". His remark on this point was "Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed?"—(1 Cor. 3:5.) Then Paul's success is evidence that he was no mere enthusiast. That he was successful cannot be denied. The modern existence of Christendom is evidence of it. His success involved the bringing over of "a great company of the priests", of the temple (Acts 6:7), and the turning away of all the lesser Asia from idolatry—(Acts 19:26). How could an enthusiast, with nothing else than ignorant heated words have achieved such results? But if Paul saw Christ and had a word of salvation from him, and if "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul", the success is accounted for; and in that case, Paul was no mere enthusiast. His words are not the words of heated enthusiasm in any case. We have them in his letters and speeches written and delivered under many circumstances, and they are all cool, sober, logical words, such as a man who had seen Christ, and who was endowed with the spirit of God would write, and never such as the victim of hallucination would write. 3, This introduces the next disproof of his having been a self-deceived enthusiast. His doings and sayings are those of a clear-headed, courteous, reasonable man, accommodating himself to circumstances as the interests of the object he had in view required, which is an entire contrast to the deportment of a self-deceived victim of a deranged imagination. Thus he is personally respectful to Felix, Festus and Agrippa, and temperate and coherent in the defence he was called upon to offer in answer to the accusation of the Jews. Let any one doubting this, read the 24th, 25th and 26th chapters of Acts. Thus also he adapted himself to the various classes with whom he came in contact in such a way as their several cases required, in regard to their acceptance of the gospel. His testimony on this point is this: "Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews, to them that are

under the law as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. To them that are without the law as without law . . . that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men that I might by all means save some.”—(1 Cor. 9:19-22.) These are not the tactics of an illusionist, but of a sensible man with an important work in hand. Enthusiasts, who are so to the extent of being victims of self-deception, do not work in this rational way. The same feature of calm good sense is illustrated by his avoidance of the martyrdom which the Jews were prepared to bestow upon him. The Jews formed a plot for his destruction at the time he was a prisoner in the hands of the Romans.—(Acts 23:12.) Paul got to know of it, and informed the Roman captain. The captain sent him to Caesarea under guard, transferring him to the jurisdiction of Felix, and afterwards of Festus. Festus sent for the Jewish council to prefer their accusation against Paul at Caesarea. When they came they asked Festus to try Paul’s case at Jerusalem, intending to kill him on the way thither. Paul said he was not unwilling to die if he was proved worthy of death; but he objected to be given into the hands of the Jews, and appealed to be reserved to the hearing of Caesar at Rome. This was not the action of an enthusiast, who would have rushed with bravado into the jaws of death. It was the action of a reasonable man who felt and tried to avoid the calamities incident to his position as an apostle, but who, nevertheless, persevered in the testimony that brought them, because he knew it was true. The same remarks apply to the case in which he made use of his status as a Roman citizen to avoid examination by scourging.—(Acts 22:25.) It was the act of a cool and astute and sensible man and not of an enthusiast, who would simply have blundered himself into difficulties in a heated and irrational manner, and lacked capacity or desire to extricate himself in a sensible way. 4, Enthusiasts are usually vain, and have a conceit of their personal importance in relation to whatever hobby they have in hand. Paul’s letters exhibit the reverse of this. He says of himself that he “was not meet to be called an apostle” (1 Cor. 15:9), and this not in a mawkish spirit of self-depreciation, but for a reason which he immediately adds, “because I persecuted the church of God.” For the same reason he styles himself “less than the least of all saints” (Eph. 3:8), and also “the chief of sinners” — (1 Tim. 1:15). In 1 Cor. 11, he apologises for having to indulge in self-vindication in defence against the slanders of traducers. These are not the expressions of a self-deceived and egotistic enthusiast: they are just the sort of expressions to be expected from a capable man who had committed a great mistake through ignorance, but who, with all his faculties about him, had seen his mistake, and, under a deep sense of humiliation, was striving to undo the mistake by a lifetime of exertion.

The facts of the case distinctly exclude the theory of Paul being a self-deceived enthusiast. Therefore the only enquiry remaining, is whether he was deceived by others, to which the answer is brief. This was perhaps sufficiently touched on the third night of the debate. It was shown that the occurrence which changed him from a persecutor into a defender of the Christian faith, was of such a nature as

not to admit of the operation of third parties in the way of deception — (Acts 9; 26). As Paul afterwards said to Agrippa, it was a thing “not done in a corner”, but in the presence of a band of officers, and in the full blaze of the noon-day sun. Paul and the whole company were struck to the earth by a light “above the brightness of the sun”. A communication was made to Paul in their presence, audible to them all, but intelligible only to Paul, as it was made in “the Hebrew tongue”. They heard the voice, but saw no man. The attempt of Mr. Bradlaugh to make a contradiction between the account which says they heard the voice and the account which says they did not hear the voice, was disposed of in the debate. They heard the voice but could not make out the words. So may we dispose of Mr. Bradlaugh’s attempt to make a difficulty of the fact that one account says they all fell to the earth and another that “they stood speechless”. The two statements are perfectly reconcilable if we suppose the company were felled to the earth by the first burst of the brightness, and afterwards rose and stood speechless while Paul received the communication addressed to him. This is not a gratuitous supposition; for that they did rise to their feet after falling is certain, seeing they afterwards led Paul by the hand to Damascus. Two truthful accounts must be consistent one with another, even if they appear contradictory; and the lover of truth is not to be scared away from the endeavour to establish their consistency by the irrational dogmatism (unconcerned to find the truth), which says there ought to be nothing to reconcile. When the incident was at an end, Paul was found to be blind and remained blind for three days, and only had his sight restored by the healing interposition of one of the Christian disciples of Damascus whom he had come to destroy. This evidence of the reality of the revelation to Paul was left behind in a way that made doubt impossible. The whole event was of a character that did not admit of third parties interposing as deceivers of Paul. Consequently, the theory that he was an enthusiast deceived by others has no standing ground. Only the fourth hypothesis remains, that he was a true man, undeceived by himself or others, who relates what actually occurred, to whom Christ actually appeared, who really wrought miracles, and who is, therefore, a true witness of the resurrection of Christ, and, therefore, of the divinity of the Scriptures.

MR. BRADLAUGH’S ARGUMENT.

Mr. Bradlaugh made no attempt to explain Paul’s case in harmony with the atheistic theory. He simply refused to look at it. He said he had no evidence that Paul ever existed, although, inconsistently enough, he refused to say, when pressed on the point, that Paul’s letters were forgeries. He rightly defined literary forgery to be the writing of any document in another man’s name: yet he would not commit himself to the affirmation that the epistles of Paul were forgeries. If he could have substantiated the notion that they are forgeries, he would have asserted it gladly, of course. His refusal to assert it is, therefore, evidence that he

knows the notion that they are forged cannot be maintained (as indeed the whole world of critics, if not Mr. Bradlaugh, is well aware). Therefore, the fact that Paul wrote the epistles is proved by the very tactics of the man who professed to doubt that there ever was such a man. Consequently, the case of Paul is a fact. The nature of the case was pressed upon Mr. Bradlaugh's attention, and he was asked for an explanation of it on his hypothesis; but he did not advance an explanation. His not advancing an explanation is proof that he could not explain it, and his inability to explain it is a proof that the case is inexplicable on atheistic grounds, and that the only explanation of it that can be given is the explanation given many times by Paul himself, that Christ appeared to him and endowed him with power to execute a mission in his name to the nations of the earth — in which case, Christ rose from the dead, and the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation.

In default of dealing with Paul's case, Mr. Bradlaugh contented himself with repeating, in a rabid and offensive style, the alleged inconsistencies and contradictions in the Bible he had enumerated on the previous evenings. As these have been answered in the review of the first and second evenings, it is not necessary to notice them here. It is sufficient to supply the proof which he demanded, that the apostles were ignorant men. It is to be found in Acts 4:13: "Now when they (the rulers) saw the boldness of Peter, and John, *and perceiving that they were UNLEARNED AND IGNORANT MEN*, they marvelled."

The only other point really calling for notice is Mr. Bradlaugh's attempt to make the Bible responsible for the doctrine of eternal torments. For the full treatment of this subject, including a scriptural exegesis of the terms on which Mr. Bradlaugh relied as proving this, the reader had better refer to *Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torment*: being an answer to the "Rev." Dr. Angus, by R. Roberts. It is to be had at the office mentioned on the cover of this pamphlet, price 8d.

FOURTH NIGHT.

MR. ROBERTS' ARGUMENT.

MR. ROBERTS was somewhat diverted from the argument he had intended to elaborate this evening, by the stress laid by Mr. Bradlaugh on the absence (as he alleged) of contemporary witness to the currency of the apostolic writings in the first century and first half of the second century. The objection was of little weight even if well founded; because a book might exist from remote antiquity, and bear internal proof of its having done so, without our being able to find other books of a similar age in which it should be mentioned. The absence of such other books would be no disproof of the book we have. It would only prove that no other

books had survived for the same number of ages, and this fact would not be wonderful in view of the now public character of the New Testament, and the private character of the books alleged to be absent. But though the point was of no great weight in true logic, Mr. Roberts felt it might seem weighty to some, and therefore occupied a considerable part of the time in showing that contrary to Mr. Bradlaugh's assertion, there were books, traceable back to the first and second centuries, in which the contemporary existence of the New Testament was distinctly recognised. The doing this, prevented him from saying all he intended to say in support of the affirmation to which he had intended to devote the evening, viz: "That the literary and moral peculiarities of the Bible — the character of its sentiments, so entirely alien to the universal tendencies of human nature—Jew and Gentile—It's clear, chaste, vigorous and concise diction—It's agreement one part with another, notwithstanding the great intervals of time at which its different parts were produced; and its perfectly artless candour in the record of facts irrespective of their bearing for or against the interests involved — are totally at variance with the supposition that the book is the production of ignorant and designing men; and prove that its existence is due to that divine initiative and guidance in the writers to which both Paul and Peter attributed it."

In support of this proposition, Mr. Roberts intended a line of argument which was only partly carried out. The omitted parts may be briefly indicated.

The internal constitution of the Bible is the strongest evidence of its divinity. This argument is the least capable of being made palpable, especially to those unacquainted with the Bible and unaccustomed to the line of thought which it involves. The proposition falls at first with little weight on the ear; but its weight increases with increasing experience of human nature and human literature, until at last the thinking mind can dispense with all other evidence of the Bible's divinity. Its contents are found sufficient.

Some features of these contents were noticed in the debate. Its revelation concerning God is first in rank. This is distinguished from all human conceptions of Deity, as reflected in the polytheisms of confessedly unenlightened men. The gods imagined by men were limited like men. The God revealed in the Bible is declared *unsearchable*. The different powers of nature were, by the ignorant, attributed to different gods, which superficially seemed probable. The Bible attributed all to ONE GOD. Science has confirmed the Bible revelation of God to this extent, that it has shown all power to be ONE at the root, and that root "unknowable", which is only another word for the Bible term "unsearchable".

Then as to man: the philosophers taught that man was constitutionally an immaterial immortal being, underlying and distinct from the body, and capable of existence apart from it, a fallacy from which came their doctrine of *post-mortem* rewards and punishments in the elysian fields and tartarus, and a consequent rejection of the doctrine of the resurrection. This notion, succinctly defined as "the immortality of the soul", was, like their polytheism, a plausible deduction

from appearances — universal among the ancients, beginning with the Egyptians, notwithstanding his association with whom, Moses, by the admission of Gibbon, is untainted with the notion. The prophets and apostles are likewise free of this philosophic speculation, and, on the contrary, teach human mortality as expounded by Tyndall and other scientists of the modern era. The doctrine of immortality which they teach is the hope of resurrection to a future existence on the earth. Science does not teach this, because science only deals with *what is*, and can throw no light on what is to be. With the doctrine of human mortality all Scripture agrees, as the reader may find proved in *Twelve Lectures*, by R. Roberts. Consequently, the Bible is in harmony with science on the subject of man as well as God: that is, as regards his harmony with present constitution. That the Bible should teach a doctrine in harmony with science in an age when all the world was dreaming about natural immortality of speculative induction, is another proof of the Bible's divinity. This argument has been obscured by orthodox religion, which accepts the Pagan view, and, by consequence, teaches the eternal torment of the unrighteous — a doctrine which gives the argument for unbelief an advantage that does not belong to it.

The Bible's depreciation of human nature, and exaltation of God, were both noticed in the debate. These peculiarities stamp it as of Divine origin. The sentiments are foreign to human nature. Their prominence in the mouths of the prophets explain the Jewish treatment of the prophets; and that treatment reacts in confirmation of the Divine origin of the sayings of the prophets. Jesus refers to it thus: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, &c.*" (Luke 13:34). There was a class of prophet that received different treatment, to which Jesus also refers: "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you, for *so did their fathers to THE FALSE PROPHETS*"—(Luke 6:26). The false prophets spoke smooth or pleasant things, which ensured popularity: the true prophets spoke things that were disagreeable to human nature, and brought destruction on themselves. Yet the Scriptures of the disagreeable prophets, which testify against the wickedness of Israel, are preserved, while the Scriptures of the false prophets have perished: in which also there is evidence of God at work.

The aversion of Israel to the teaching of the true prophets, and their relish for those who led them to idolatry, is very effectually illustrated in the case of Elijah, who, on Mount Carmel single-handed, confronted four hundred prophets of Baal. This case may be taken as the history of the subject condensed into a single incident. The Jews have always been on the side of those who drew them aside from the One God, and against the few faithful men who in different ages have striven, under Divine command, to bring them back to the paths of Moses. This is in harmony with the work of the prophets being a Divine work; and inconsistent with the notion that they acted on their own uninspired volition; for a human volition merely would have led them in a human and popular direction.

Why did the Jews prefer idolatry to the Divine institutions? This brings us to another argument. The Mosaic worship was contrary to human inclinations. It called on them to serve *an invisible God*: it required faith at their hands. Other nations had gods they could see, and whose worship they made the occasion of licence and delight. To these foreign gods, Israel turned aside from the beginning of their history, as soon as Joshua and his contemporaries were dead (Judges 2:11-13); which is proof that their God was no invention of their own; or the outcome of a national idiosyncrasy. Other nations have always been faithful to their invented gods, because they continued subject to the taste and fancy that led to the invention. Such a thing as a nation changing its gods is unknown. This very fact is made the basis of expostulation by God with Israel, through the prophet Jeremiah: "Pass over to the Isles of Chittim and see, and send unto Kedar and consider diligently, and see if there be such a thing: *hath a nation changed their gods*, which are yet no gods? But my people hath changed their glory for that which doth not profit."—(Jer. 2:10). This fact of itself — that the Jews as a nation continually departed from the God of their fathers, while no other nation deviated from their traditional idolatries — goes a long way, in a logical process of treatment, to prove that the religion of the Jews was not a religion of Jewish origin, in the sense of its being the invention of the Jews; but was higher than they, namely, what it professes to be: a system Divinely communicated to them by the hand of Moses.

There is next the agreement of one part of the Bible with another throughout, notwithstanding the long intervals during which its different parts were produced. If it were a human production, each successive contributor would have imparted his own sentiments to it, and we should have that diversity of character which belongs to every human work in which many actors have been engaged during a series of ages. Instead of this, the book is absolutely one. Whether you take Moses, Malachi or Christ, there is the same depreciation of human nature; the same supreme exaltation of God; the same stern enunciation of duty; the same uncompromising rebuke of departure from the way of right. The spirit of the book in this respect is identical throughout, and this cannot be said of any literature under the sun, in which a variety of writers of different ages have been employed, nor is there any book under the sun characterised by the sentiments just enumerated. The Bible stands absolutely alone in this respect, like a majestic mountain among hillocks of rubbish.

Then there is the same hope, in all the books of the Bible, of a coming age in which Christ, as King of Israel, shall rule on earth universally, and mankind be blessed. A few illustrations of this must suffice. Genesis speaks of a promise to Abraham, that in him and his seed (a great personage who should possess the gate of his enemies), at a future time, should all the families of the earth be blessed.—(Gen. 22:17-18.) Moses speaks of a prophet like unto himself, whom God should raise up to Israel whom they should hear.—(Deut. 18:15-18.) Isaiah

speaks of a king who should rise in the line of David, and reign over all nations, with the result of abolishing the art of war from the studies of mankind.—(Isa. 11:1-9; 2:4; 32:1-8.) Daniel speaks of one like the Son of Man who should appear, and whom all peoples, nations and languages should serve and obey.—(Dan. 7:14.) Paul speaks of a day in which God should judge the world in righteousness by Christ (Acts 17:31), and when the people of Christ would reign and judge the world with him.—(1 Cor. 6:2; 2 Tim. 2:12.) Revelation speaks of the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of God and His Christ, who shall reign for ever and ever.—(Rev. 2:26; 11:15.)

If the Bible were a merely human production, there would not be this absolute identity of hope among writers, extending over three thousand years. The existence of this identity is a proof of the controlling presence of a common guidance in all the writers, even the guidance professed in the book itself: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Pet 1:21.) The force of this argument will be appreciated by those who realise the endless and contradictory diversities of human authorship of different ages. Its force is somewhat hidden by the corruptions of orthodox Christendom, which has long ago abandoned the one apostolic "hope of Israel", common to the whole Scriptures, and embraced the miserable substitute of an imagined *post mortem* beatification of an imaginary personal invisibility, in regions above the stars.

Then there is evidence of divinity in the Bible scheme of future life. This scheme defers all reward till an appointed era, to be inaugurated by the personal re-appearance of Christ in the earth, when many generations shall have yielded — first, to the grave and then to the resurrection — their quota of tried men — tried in necessary times of evil. The vastness and splendour of this scheme stamps it as divine. Man would never have invented such a scheme. This is not the place to prove that this is the scheme. The reader must be referred to *Twelve Lectures*, before mentioned for its full illustration.

Next there is the perfect candour of the Bible narratives, which is never characteristic of human histories. David's crime is chronicled in sober and merciless truth, although he was king when the record was written. So with the fathers before him. The naked truth is told. The very things which Mr. Bradlaugh makes use of against the Bible, are in this respect one of the highest evidences of its genuine character, for had the Bible been written by king-flatterers and sycophants, as his senseless tirades imply, there would have been a suppression of things that do not stand to the credit of those for whom they are supposed by him to have been written. Then the writers say things that never would have been said by men writing to prop up a pretended revelation. Matthew, for instance, records that at an interview with Christ after his resurrection, some of his disciples "doubted."—(Matt. 28:17.) A bolsterer up of a pretended revelation would never have written this. It is written because it is true; and the fact that some doubted is an element in the self-evident truthfulness of the narrative, for it is just what

would happen with real living men who, not expecting Christ to die, had seen Christ crucified and now saw him alive. In their partly-enlightened state, his death was a puzzle and his resurrection a puzzle also, and "doubt" the natural consequence. And had there been no further evidence, the doubt of the "some" might have continued. But their doubt did not continue; all doubts vanished with the outpouring of the Spirit and display of miraculous gifts. The fact that they previously "doubted" made their subsequent confidence all the more reliable, because it showed the reason of their doubt had disappeared. Certainly, a forger, writing a fictitious narrative to obtain credit for Christ's resurrection, would never have represented any of the disciples in the act of doubting but rather in an ecstasy of adoring confidence, after the style of Roman Catholic fables.

Similar remarks apply to the statement of John that at a certain time, "many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him." This is a candid record of a fact which there could be no object in publishing, but rather in suppressing, as the fact itself was capable of yielding a damaging effect to some who might argue like Mr. Bradlaugh: "If men who saw his miracles deserted him, how can you expect me to believe, &c." Its record is an evidence of truth; and the occurrence of the fact recorded is in harmony with our acquaintance with human nature. Men get accustomed to anything. Marvels cease to be marvels when they are of common occurrence. It is easy to understand that men, drawn after Christ in the first instance by the sensational attraction of his miracles, would easily become disaffected when doctrines unpleasant to human nature were propounded for their acceptance. It is human nature to the life. A fictitious writer would never have imagined it possible for any human being to desert the Christ of his narrative: he would be certain to represent every one as awe-struck and spell-bound for ever. And even if he could have imagined another possibility, he would have been careful to conceal it from a narrative intended to create confidence in a Christ that never existed. The record that many ceased to be his disciples is one among many strong proofs of the genuineness of the narrative.—There is a number of such candid statements. In fact, they abound throughout the Scriptures and constitute an evidence in the very opposite direction to that to which such as Mr. Bradlaugh make them point. We must be content with the two examples cited.

Then the literary character of the Bible is evidence of a more than human authorship. Its diction is chaste, dignified, vigorous, free of redundancy or irrelevant details. It is unlike all other books in the nature of its historic narratives. It never puts on record the kind of occurrences that come under the category of story and adventure. It never shows any regard for the curiosity of the reader. It never ministers to the taste that finds pleasure in the mere knowledge of what happens. It confines itself to matters having relation to the main purpose in hand. If it ever diverges from its condensed historical style, and enters into personal particulars, it is because those personal particulars have a bearing on some subsequent event of public importance, or to illustrate the operation of some truth

important to be known. The story of Amon and Tamar is an example: it led up to the rebellion of Absalom. The story of David and Uriah is another: it led to a public revolution in the punishment of David. The story of the Ephraimite and his concubine is another: it led to the near extirpation of a tribe, and the slaughter of multitudes in Israel in punishment of their sins. In no case is a story told for its own sake. In this the Bible differs from all human books: and the difference is inexplicable if the Bible be a human book; because if a human book, it would show the universal taste for mere incident, in the liking for which, Jew and Gentile are alike, as shown by the writings of Josephus. The following is a good specimen of the Bible's historical conciseness: "Then were the people of Israel divided into two parts; half of the people followed Tibni, the son of Ginath, to make him king; and half followed Omri. But the people that followed Omri prevailed against the people that followed Tibni, the son of Ginath; so Tibni died, and Omri reigned."—(1 Kings 16:21.) A human account of this matter would have entered upon the intrigues and the fightings, and the adventures incident to the triumph of Omri, with a due admixture of trumpet blowings over this one's intrepidity, and that one's wonderful generalship, &c. This argument in its full force will only be appreciated by those who possess a thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, and some acquaintance with human writings of all ages. With such it is of great weight. To others, it may be evident by a comparison between the Bible itself and all imitations that have been attempted, such as the Apocrypha and Apocryphal New Testament.

Finally, the character and precepts of Christ as displayed in the New Testament, are themselves conclusive evidence of the divinity of the Scriptures. No man could have imagined such a character; no man could have invented such precepts, least of all such men as those who wrote the gospel narrative — poor fishermen, "unlearned and ignorant men." The only way such a narrative could come to be written (even if men who are called "learned", had been writers) — is by the appearance of such a man as Christ, and the presence with the writers of such a guidance in the writers as Christ promised he would send them after his departure — the guidance of the Holy Spirit which should "bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them."

MR. BRADLAUGH'S ARGUMENT.

There was little in Mr. Bradlaugh's argument on the fourth night calling for any further notice than what it received in Mr. Robert's replies. It was in the nature of a feint to draw the other side from a strong position. He raised a great outcry against the ecclesiastical writers of the first, second and third centuries, whose works Mr. Roberts referred to merely to show that there was external evidence of the existence of the New Testament at the time it professes to have been produced. Many things he said that were misleading, and some that were

positively untrue. Such, for instance, as his remark, "It is simple impertinence (for Mr. Roberts) to read names to us and tell us he has got the books here when those books do not exist in the world." "Mr. Roberts said he would quote to you from Tatian. There is not a scrap of Tatian existing . . ." Mr. Roberts did not pretend to have books that do not exist. He did not pretend to have even all the books that do exist. When he said he produced "five witnesses" to a particular date, he meant in the sense of producing them in argument. Tatian's existence as an author is proved by quotations from him in Eusebius, who wrote shortly after the end of the third century. On the same authority we know that Tatian was born before A.D.150, and that he wrote a book entitled *A Harmony of the Four Gospels*. The fact that we do not possess this *Harmony of the Four Gospels* does not weaken the evidence arising from the fact of Tatian writing such a work. His writing such a work shows that the four gospels existed in his day, and also that they had existed as a universally-accepted authority among Christians for a long time before, for men do not write harmonies of unknown and newly-produced books. But Mr. Bradlaugh sought to obscure the argument by making a great outcry about the absence of Tatian's books, and, no doubt, he succeeded with some lacking penetration, but the truth calmly remains for all that.

Mr. Bradlaugh also made a point of the dates adduced being "disputed dates". In the sense that they lack the definiteness and certainty of a registrar's certificate of birth, no doubt they may be disputed; but they are undisputed in the substantial sense. That is they are substantial approximations to truth, and even allowing for a few years' uncertainty, one side or another, the argument founded on the writings of the men remain untouched. The argument is that men living within a few years of the dates mentioned could not quote the New Testament familiarly, which they all do, if the New Testament had not existed as a widely-accepted authority. Mr. Bradlaugh's tactics merely amounted to throwing so much dust over this point. His reckless declarations will have no weight with those who are calmly in search of truth and reason.

Mr. Bradlaugh made great use of the literary forgeries that were undoubtedly common in the third and fourth centuries. He asked among so many forgeries, how was he to know the true? He might have been excused on the score of inability of discernment had he rested there: but when he went on to deny the existence of true apostolic writings, it had simply to be shown that he was going against all reason; for surely the very existence of forgeries prove that there must have been something originally true and valuable to imitate. Mr. Bradlaugh's answer to this was, "If Mr. Roberts' contention is true, the existence of a false gospel of Barnabas would be evidence of an imitation of a true gospel of Barnabas." The rejoinder is, first, perhaps there was a true gospel of Barnabas, for Luke testifies (Luke 1:1) that "many" had taken in hand to set forth an account of the things believed among the Christians, and perhaps Barnabas was among the number. But, secondly, it would at least prove the existence either of

Barnabas or of the New Testament allusion to Barnabas. And it would prove that the writing of a gospel was according to the imitator's conception of what Barnabas was likely to do; and this conception must have been founded on the fact that the apostles and their companions did write gospels. So that even in this way, a false gospel of Barnabas, while perhaps not proving a true gospel of Barnabas, would prove that there were true gospels somewhere. We notice this point because it is one of the few arguments of Mr. Bradlaugh's which seemingly had something in them. Mr. Bradlaugh tried to make a great deal out of the fact that Mr. Roberts did not read extracts from the books of the early ecclesiastical writers, in support of his assertion that they quoted from the New Testament. He even said unjustifiable and untrue things on the subject; as for instance, that these writers "do not say a word of what Mr. Roberts thought they said." The best answer to this will be to quote a few samples of their sayings, with references to the works where they may be found. This is done by the aid of Dr. Brewer's compilation, which was produced at the discussion.

1.—CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA,

Who was born somewhere about the middle of the second century: died about A.D.213.

He wrote several works in Greek, and among others *Poedagogus* (The Instructor), and *Stromata* (Sundries). From these two the following are extracts: "This passage is not to be found in any of the FOUR GOSPELS, but is taken from the (spurious) gospel to the Egyptians."—(*Strom.* 3, 465, D.) "As Luke in *the Acts of the Apostles* records Paul to have said."—(*Strom.* 5, 588, B.) "In like manner writes Paul in his *Epistle to the Romans*."—(*Strom.* 3, 457, B.) "The blessed Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, says, Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children."—(*Poed.* 1, 96, D.)

2.—THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH,

Who was born early in the second century, and died A.D.181.

He wrote three books, to "Autolychus", in defence of the Christian religion. The following are extracts: "These things the Holy Scriptures teach us: for JOHN says, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (Book 2, 100 C.) The gospel says "Love your enemies, and pray for them that spitefully use you, for if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? Do not even publicans the same?"—(Book 3, 126, B.C.)

3.—ATHENAGORAS, THE ATHENIAN PHILOSOPHER,

Who flourished in the second half of the second century.

He wrote a petition to the Emperor on behalf of the Christians whom he had joined: also a treatise on the resurrection. The following are extracts: "To convince you we are not Atheists, hear the maxims in which we are instructed:" "I say unto you, love your enemies: bless them that curse you and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father in heaven, who maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."—(*Petition*, page 11. B.C.) "The corruptible must put on incorruption" (*The Resurrection*, page 61, C).

4.—IRENÆUS, OF LYONS,

Who was born about A.D. 130, and died A.D. 202.

He wrote a work "against heresies" in five books. The following are extracts: "Matthew, among the Jews, wrote a gospel in their own language while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome. After the death of the fore-named apostles, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that Peter had preached. Next Luke, Paul's companion, put down in a book the gospel preached by Paul. Lastly John, the beloved disciple, published his gospel while he was dwelling at Ephesus" (*Adv. Hoer.* 3, 1). "This same disciple (John) says in his epistle, little children, it is the last time"—(*Adv. Hoer.* 3, 16). Irenæus also mentions by name thirteen of Paul's epistles, and quotes copiously from them in the course of his argument, and speaks of "The Revelation of John", the disciple of the Lord.

5.—MELITO OF SARDIS,

Who flourished in the second half of the second century.

He wrote several works in Greek, and among others, one entitled *Extracts of the Law and the Prophets*, in his preface to which he says: "When I went into the East, I procured an accurate account of the books of *The Old Testament*", which is, of course, an indirect recognition of the New Testament.

6.—TATIAN,

Who was born about A.D. 130, and died about the close of the second century.

He wrote several works, only one of which is now extant, viz., *Oration to the Greeks*, in which he quotes from the epistles. Eusebius mentions the name of one of Tatian's other works, which furnishes evidence of the existence of the gospels in Tatian's day, viz., *A Harmony of the Four Gospels*.

7.—JUSTIN MARTYR,

Who was born about the beginning of the second century and died about A.D. 167

He wrote three works, viz., an *Apology* to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, on behalf of the Christians; an *Apology* to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius with the same object, and a *Dialogue with Trypho*. His quotations from the New Testament are very numerous. The following are specimens:—"Christ said, Unless a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."—(*Apology*, 94A). "Before the Lord was crucified, he said, 'The Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected of the Scribes and Pharisees, and be crucified, and the third day he shall rise again.'"—(*Dialogue*, 327A). "Paul, in his address to the Greeks, saith thus: 'Be you as I am, for I am as ye are.'"—(*Dialogue*, 40D).

8.—PAPIAS,

Who was born early in the second century and died about A.D. 153.

He wrote *Five Books of Commentaries on the Sayings of our Lord*. In his preface he says: "If at any time I met with one who had conversed with the elders, I enquired of the sayings of those elders. I asked him what Andrew or Peter said, what Philip said, what Thomas or James had said, what John had said, what Matthew had said or any other of the Lord's apostles. What they told me by word of mouth have I here set down in writing, and nothing in these Commentaries has been taken from books." Of Matthew, he says: "It was written in Hebrew and was termed *the Lord's sayings*;" and of Mark: "Mark was the interpreter and follower of Peter, and the *gospel which bears his name* was composed from Peter's own words."—(Book 3, 31.)

9.—POLYCARP,

Who was born about A.D. 80, and died A.D. 167.

He wrote an epistle to the Philippians. The following are extracts recognising the existence of the New Testament: "Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?" (Cap. 11). "Neither I nor any one like me can come up to the wisdom of the blessed Paul, who wrote to you a letter, being absent in body but present in spirit".—(Cap. 3). "Remember what the Lord said, Judge not that ye be not judged; forgive and ye shall be forgiven; be merciful that ye may obtain mercy."—(Cap. 2.)

10.—IGNATIUS,

Who was born about A.D.35, and died about A.D.107.

He wrote seven epistles in which the existence of the New Testament is recognised thus: "You are the companions of St. Paul, who *throughout his whole epistle to you* (the Ephesians), mentions you with praise."—(Epistle to the Ephesians, sec.12.) He many times quotes, without acknowledgement, the words of the New Testament. Thus: "The tree is known by its fruits" (to the Eph. 14): "Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves" (to *Polycarp* 2). "Christ was baptised of John to fulfil all righteousness (to *Smyrna* 1.)

11.—HERMAS,

Who flourished before the end of the first century.

He wrote a book entitled *The Shepherd*, in which there are some fifty quotations from the New Testament, without naming the books from which the quotations are drawn. The following are specimens: "No man cometh unto the Father but through the Son."—(*Similitude* 9:12.) "The body is the temple of the Holy Spirit: and if thou defile the temple of God thou shalt die."—(*Sim.* 5, 7). "If ye resist the devil he will flee from you."—(*Precept* 12, 5).

12.—CLEMENT OF ROME,

Who was born about A.D.30 and died A.D.100.

He wrote an epistle to the Corinthians, in which the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians is expressly referred to thus: "Take into your hands *the epistle of Paul the apostle, and see what he wrote to you.*"—(ch. 47). He quotes many times from the New Testament, without referring to the source, thus: "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again"—(Ch. 13). "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, "Woe to that man by whom offences come. It were better for that man if he had not been born."—(ch. 46) "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth."—(ch. 56).

13.—BARNABAS,

Who is supposed to have been born at the beginning of the first century, and to have died A.D. 61.

The epistle bearing his name, whether written by him or not, was extant in the first century, as proved by the allusions of other writers to it. He quotes from Matthew, Luke, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Pet. and Revelation. Examples: "Let us beware, lest it should happen unto us; many are called but few chosen"—(ch. 4). "He came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance."—(ch. 5). "Give to every one that asketh thee."—(ch. 19.)

FIFTH NIGHT.

MR. ROBERTS' ARGUMENT.

THE argument on the origin of the Jewish nation as involved in the writings of Moses, was fairly indicated, but only partly illustrated. It is capable of being worked out in great detail with convincing results. The authenticity of the writings is sufficiently established by the testimony of Christ and the voice of the Jewish nation, as pointed out and proved in the debate. We have therefore merely to consider the history set forth. This history, like the history of Christianity, is only intelligible with God in it. This will be seen by anyone fairly looking into it. With such a view only can we understand the entire absence of any endeavour in any part of it, to ascribe the law to Moses or any credit of any part of the transactions to him, or to the Jewish nation. So far from taking credit, Moses expressly said to the people, "I have not done these things of mine own mind" (Num. 16:8). It is a popular habit to ascribe the Jewish law to the wisdom of Moses as if he were the author of it. This habit is totally at variance with the scriptural representation. God is always kept in the foreground and Moses appears as His servant only. This peculiarity is not confined to the language of Moses, but belongs to the events connected with the organization of the nation. It is particularly manifest in the incident on which Moses based his claim to Israel's submission to the law. He did not, like an impostor, merely report that so and so had happened to him privately, and that the result was this law which they had to obey. He based his claim to their submission on an open and public event of which they were all witnesses. "He brought forth the people out of the camp *to meet with God*, and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And Mount Sinai was altogether in a smoke because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof went up as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly" — (Ex. 19:17). The people were afraid at the manifestation. "And all the people saw the thunderings and the lightnings and the noise of the trumpet and the mountain smoking, and when the people saw it, they removed and stood afar off. And they said unto Moses, speak thou with us and we will hear, but let not God speak with us lest we die." — (Ex. 20:18, 19). Afterwards referring to this, Moses asks them to remember it: "Specially the day that thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Horeb when the Lord said unto me, Gather me the people together and I will make them HEAR my words *that they may learn to fear ME* all the days that they shall live upon the earth . . . and the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire. Ye heard the voice of the Lord, but saw no similitude: only ye heard a voice . . . Did ever people hear the voice of God as thou hast heard and live? . . . Out of heaven, He made thee to hear His voice that He might instruct thee: and upon earth He showed thee His great fire and thou heardest His voice out of the midst of the

fire” — (Deut. 4:10-12; 33, 36.) It was this public demonstration that laid the foundation of the authority over a rebellious nation like Israel, of Moses, whom they several times sought to destroy. This was the object of it. It is so stated: “The Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I came unto thee in a thick cloud, *that the people may hear when I speak with thee* AND BELIEVE THEE FOR EVER.”—(Ex. 19:9). When the event was over, “The Lord said unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *Ye have seen* that I have talked with you from heaven.”—(Ex. 20:22).

Now for the present argument, it matters not whether these things really happened, or were invented by a writer who narrated them to establish the credit of Moses. The great fact connected with them lies here: *they base the authority of the law on the command of God and never on the wisdom of Moses.* And the argument arising from this fact is that such a thing is inexplicable on the hypothesis of the Mosaic writings being writings of a merely human origin, for written with a human origin, they would have been written with a human aim like all other human writings; and the aim would have been to show that the law was due to the superior sagacity of Moses, and to set forth the constant loyalty of the Israelites to it. Of course, the argument is strengthened a hundred fold when it is shown that Moses was the writer.

The nature of the sentiment pervading the law, is inconsistent with the idea of a human origin. We know what human nature is in the thousand instances of experience, history and political institutions. To glorify the leader or the nation, is the tendency of all men in every country and age; and the Jews, as we know them in their speeches and literature, are no exception. But the Mosaic institutions offer a complete contrast to this tendency. Instead of boasting in ancestry and the exploits of their armies, they were taught, for instance, to speak depreciatingly of their origin on the presentation of the first-fruits; and to refer their deliverance to God. They were taught to say, “A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation great, mighty and populous. And the Egyptians evilly entreated us and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage. And when we cried unto the Lord God of our fathers, the Lord heard our voice, and looked on our affliction, and our labour and our oppression. And *the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt* with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with great terribleness, and with signs and wonders.” The deliverance of Israel is never ascribed to Israelitish prowess. The style of allusion is well illustrated in Psalm 44:1-3: “We have heard with our ears, O God: our fathers have told us what work Thou didst in their days, in the times of old, how Thou didst drive out the heathen with Thy hand, and plantedst them: how Thou didst afflict the people and cast them out. For *they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them; but THY RIGHT HAND AND THINE ARM* and the light of Thy countenance, because Thou hadst a favour unto them.”

This peculiarity is intelligible enough if God spake to Moses and did all the mighty works by which Israel was delivered from Egyptian thralldom. On any other principle, it is unintelligible. Particularly is this the case with certain matters of detail. There are features in the law which could not have originated with men legislating out of their own heads. For instance, Israel was commanded to let the land lie untended and unsown every seventh year; and we read this in connection with it: "And if ye shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? Behold, we shall not sow nor gather in our increase. Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and *it shall bring forth fruit for THREE YEARS.*"—(Lev. 25:2.) What man or men would have been mad enough to append to a public law a provision beyond all human control (affecting the weather and the crops), and subject to the test of experience once in every seven years? For inventors to have enacted such a law would have been to make the detection of their imposture inevitable; and that in a short time, for once in every seven years it would be found whether, as a matter of fact, the enhanced production took place. Take God out of this law, and its enactment is inexplicable; but if God spake by Moses, it is perfectly intelligible.

So with the attendance at the periodical feasts exacted of all Israel. Three times a year were they all to assemble at the chosen centre. In the natural order, obedience to this would expose their country to the danger of invasion, while they were absent, but this assurance was associated with the law. "Neither shall any man desire thy land when thou shalt go up thrice in the year to appear before the Lord thy God."—(Ex. 34:24.) If God gave the law, this is intelligible, because, as with the weather and the crops, so with the matter of human desires, it is in His power to regulate their operation; but if this law was a human invention, it is impossible to conceive how a promise came to be introduced as to affairs beyond human control, and the truthfulness of which was open to test every year.

There is a variety of incidents and other matters of detail to which the same general remarks apply, viz., that their record is inexplicable on any theory short of the narrative being a true one. The length to which the review has already extended forbids more than a brief reference to one or two of them. Prominent among them is the reason given for Moses, who led them out of Egypt, not being allowed to take the children of Israel over Jordan into the Land of Promise and not being allowed to enter there himself. Moses alluding to this reason in his rehearsal on the plains of Moab, says: "The Lord was *angry with me* for your sakes, saying, Thou also shalt not go in thither. But Joshua, the son of Nun, which standeth before thee, he shall go in thither; encourage him, for he shall cause Israel to inherit it"—(Deut. 1:37.) The incident to which Moses alludes is described in detail in Num. 20:7-13; and expressly referred to in Num. 27:12-14. On the reading of these parts, it will be found that the incident in brief was this: under the irritation caused by the continual discontent and insubordination of the people, Moses, when directed by God to bring water for them out of the rock, struck the rock twice with his rod, and took the credit of bringing out the water. "Hear now, ye rebels", he

exclaimed, “*must* WE fetch you water out of this rock?” This was an offence to God in standing between Him and Israel, and is thus condemned by God: “Because ye believed me not, to sanctify Me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them.”—(Num. 20:12.) Let there be read in connection with this matter the account of the death of Moses in Deut. 32:48-52 and 34:1-6; such a story is intelligible if true: but if not true, for what purpose could it have been invented? We must judge of the theory of invention in such a case by the history of invention universally. Invention is resorted to always with an object: and in a case like this (the leader of a nation), the object is to establish the credit and reputation of the man concerned. But here is an incident having the very opposite effect. Here is an account of the death of Moses, showing his career cut short in punishment for the unfaithful use of divine power in a certain matter. The man who can believe such a story to have been invented must either have a very poor acquaintance with mankind, or a poor capacity for judging of the simplest facts. Invention, in such a case, if required to account for the death of Moses before the completion of his work, would be likely to have taken the form of representing that God had told him he (Moses) was too good and great a man to be allowed to enter upon the hard and bloody work of conquering the Canaanitish nation; and that, therefore, he would let him go to rest. The “patriotic” inventor would never have represented Moses an offender against the majesty of God, and still less, that he became so through the inveterate stubbornness of the people he was leading from Egypt. Such a story is self-evidently a true one; it is evidence that God wrought with Israel, and that therefore the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation.

Other incidents of a like nature are the death of Aaron’s sons, Nadab and Abihu, by fire, for non-compliance with a divine command (Lev. 10:3); and the discouraging report of the spies sent to search the land; the people’s endorsement of it; their proposal to stone Moses, and appoint another captain, under whom they might return to Egypt: the sentence that they must as a punishment wander forty years in the wilderness, till the whole of the adults should be worn out by death (Num. 13 and 14, the whole of the chapters); the murmuring of the people for flesh, and the distress of Korah, Dathan and Abiram and the people’s sympathy with them, even after their destruction (Num. 16)—all of these, and others which will occur to the reflective reader of the Scriptures, are passages in the history of Israel that are inexplicable as to how they came to be recorded, except on the one simple principle that they happened: for the tendency of them is to blacken the national character of Israel, and to take away all ground of even the commonest human satisfaction in the contemplation of their history. The invention of records having such a tendency is inconsistent with the universally known character of man, Jew and Gentile. Where invention is resorted to, it is to heighten the credit of a nation or its leaders. These things cannot have been invented. They are recorded because they happened; and in that case, God

wrought with Israel in all their generations, from Moses to Christ, and, therefore, the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation.

MR. BRADLAUGH'S ARGUMENT.

Mr. Bradlaugh made no attempt to meet his opponent's argument, but wasted his time with the technicalities of the evidence of the so-called "Christian fathers", whose writings are extraneous to the main subject. It was, perhaps, a clever diversion — an attempt to draw the enemy from a strong position; but not the course of an earnest man, persuaded of the truth of his argument, and prepared and anxious to grapple with all difficulties on their merits. Mr. Bradlaugh aims no higher than legal strategy. His tactics were well described by a friend of his who intended the description as a compliment, but which will hardly be regarded in that light by earnest men. The friend in question, signing himself "T. Evans", described Mr. Bradlaugh as "most skilful of fence", remarking that had he not been so, "he would have been 'cornered' several times".—*National Reformer*, July 2, 1876. "Fence" is all very well in the conduct of a law case in court, where the aim is to avoid by hook or by crook material damage; but when it is resorted to in a process which concerns the investigation of truth for its own sake, it becomes an illegitimate and contemptible art, which only men bent upon a personal triumph would use. It really means the art of obscuring as much as possible the facts which the other side may seek to exhibit, and of evading the logical results of facts that have to be admitted. The employment of such an art amounts to the intrusion of brute force upon the domain of reason, and the arrest of the process of evidence by mechanical obstruction — an art cultivated by a certain class of the legal profession, but not to be considered admissible in the field of candid polemics.

An illustration of it was furnished in the very instance on which Mr. Bradlaugh's friend in question particularly complimented him, in a letter appearing at the time of the discussion in the columns of the *National Reformer*. The instance concerned the extract from Athenagoras, which was cited by Mr. Roberts to show that the New Testament existed in the days of Athenagoras, inasmuch as Athenagoras cites one of the precepts of Christ, drawn from Matt. 5:44-45. Athenagoras does not give a reference to Matthew, he uses the words of Matthew, which is the material argument in the case. But in Dr. Brewer's compilation, from which Mr. Roberts quoted the extract, the reference is supplied, not as part of the quotation but as a mere guide to the student, by which he may prove whether the words quoted are Matthew's words or no. Mr. Bradlaugh holding the book in his hand, seized hold of this feature and declared with much vehemence that the reference to Matthew was not in Athenagoras at all, but had been added by Dr. Brewer; which, of course, was true, but did not dispose of the evidence of Athenagoras at all. The evidence of Athenagoras

consisted in *his using words that are in Matthew, in describing to the Emperor the precepts in which the Christians were taught*. But Mr. Bradlaugh concealed, or sought to conceal this evidence by declaiming about the reference which had never been put forward at all! His manner of doing it betrayed a consciousness that he was indulging in artifice; but of course the unthinking portion of the audience, unable on the spot to discern between the one thing and the other, could not see the wince either in the manner or the argument, but thought a strong point had been made, while the correspondent in the *National Reformer* spoke of Mr. Bradlaugh disposing of Athenagoras "as easily as an athlete would overthrow a child". "It was shown", said he, "that the *material words* of reference had been added." The writer of these words either did not comprehend "the material words" in the argument or he deliberately lent himself to a false note of triumph. This is a fair specimen of the kind of sophistry by which thousands are daily hoodwinked, and apparently glad to be so.

The instances in which Mr. Bradlaugh did touch on the merits of the argument were few. Referring to the statement in the Mosaic account of the exodus, that the clothes of the children of Israel did not wax old during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, he asked the audience to imagine a man at the end of the forty years wearing the clothes he had when a baby. Of course the audience laughed; but the folly at which they laughed was Mr. Bradlaugh's — not the Bible's. Babies' clothes might be of unwasting stuff without being used for those who had outgrown them. Sensible mothers would put by the undecaying articles for the babies to come after; and it is only Mr. Bradlaugh's reckless logic that requires us to suppose that the Jewish mothers that came out of Egypt were less sensible than the Jewish mothers of to-day.

So when he points to John the Baptist sending disciples to Jesus to know whether he were the Christ or no, and asks how this is consistent with John having heard a voice from heaven at the Jordan, declaring at Christ's baptism that he was the Son of God, he only appears to strike a blow at the New Testament account. No better proof than this very circumstance could be given that the New Testament narrative is an unconcocted and true narrative. A concoctor of such a story would have imagined and represented John the Baptist as, of course, animated by a sublime and indomitable confidence that no circumstances could affect. But the narrative being true, we find John subject to the weakness of human nature. Shut up in prison at a time when, in common with all the disciples, he "thought the kingdom of God would immediately appear" (Luke 19:11), the overpowering effect of confinement and hope inexplicably deferred, is seen in an embassage to Christ to re-assure himself. And Christ's answer, instead of being inconsistent with truth, must appear in the opposite light to every reflecting mind. Mr. Bradlaugh asks why he did not remind John of the heavenly voice at his baptism. Jesus did better than that. He did not appeal to faltering human memory of an event already doubted; he appealed to *what was actually transpiring*. "Go

and tell John WHAT YE SEE: how that the dead are raised”, &c. If the story had been concocted, no doubt the narrative which, in the first place, would never have represented John in doubt, would, in the case of that supposition, have made Christ appeal triumphantly to the events of the Jordan.

The same train of confirmatory thought is suggested in relation to that other and more painful scene in the history of Christ, which Mr. Bradlaugh desecrated with his blasphemous declamation: viz., the agony of his expiring moments, when he exclaimed: “My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” Mr. Bradlaugh asked how such an exclamation could come from the lips of a man who knew that his death was to be the salvation of the world; and whether the words are not a confutation of his professed character. The question derives its piquancy from the assumption that the tranquillity and mental composure of the Saviour ought to have been imperturbable. No doubt, in the case of an invented Christ, it would have been so represented. We should have had the sort of demeanour imputed to him that is alleged of the canonized “saints” of Roman Catholic fable. We should have had the spectacle of a transfixed man, looking placid and at ease, and delivering himself, in beatific trance, of an unnatural speech, calling upon heaven and earth to witness his confidence and submission without murmur or wince to a death which was necessary for the salvation of men. Instead of that, we have “the man Christ Jesus”, showing all the susceptibilities of a human being. We have him approaching death the day before with a fearful apprehension that caused him to “sweat as if it were great drops of blood”. We have him praying earnestly that if it were possible, the cup might pass from him: “yet not my will but Thine be done.” After this, we have him unresistingly submitting to apprehension and condemnation and crucifixion. And then we see him transfixed on the cross, suspended in the most agonizing position in which it is possible for a human being to be placed, with the whole weight of his body bearing upon his out-stretched and lacerated hands and feet. We see him endure for six hours the fierce agonies of crucifixion, and at the end of that time, it is no unnatural sound we hear when with a loud wail of agony, he exclaims “My God! my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?” Is such a wail inconsistent with his previous knowledge in hours of calmness that God required him to die? Nay, is it inconsistent even with the continuance of that knowledge? Was it not the fact that God had forsaken him in the sense of leaving him in the hands of his enemies, and in the sense, too, of withdrawing from him that overshadowing and immeasurable presence of the Spirit that had been with him during all the days of his ministry? The “why” may seem to express surprise where expectation ought to have excluded it, but we have to think that although the fact of his death was known to him beforehand, it may be that he did not realise to himself all the horrors of the ordeal till the dark cloud actually came upon him; and that in the weakness of the hour (for he was crucified through, in or out of weakness — 2 Cor. 13:4), his mental vision may have become clouded with the shadow of death, and caused him to ask what he would not have asked in the calm prospect of the event itself. The whole picture is

thoroughly unartificial. It is such as men depicting an imaginary or invented Christ would never have drawn. No stronger evidence exists of the truth of Christ's profession and mission than those very dying words which Mr. Bradlaugh made the subject of his coarse enquiries.

SIXTH NIGHT.

MR. ROBERTS' ARGUMENT

IN nature, the argument was satisfactory, but not in extent. This was inevitable from a vast subject having to be crowded into a very small compass. Its vastness may be inferred from the fact that Bishop Newton, in attempting to illustrate the fulfilment of Bible prophecy, filled a volume of hundreds of pages.

However, its logical essence is not weakened by brevity. Its pith lies in the fact of the universal impossibility of prophecy. It is impossible to lay too much stress on this fact. The foretelling of an eclipse is not a prediction: it is merely an arithmetical deduction from known rates of progress. The predictions which belong to the Bible have to do with the state of countries, the fortunes of races, the destinies of individuals — all matters quite beyond human calculation. The results in these cases depend upon so many unknown contingencies that only a Power having control of those contingencies could say what will happen. It will convince anyone of this if they try to foretell the issues of the Eastern Question; the future of France; the fate of the Disraeli Ministry, or the destiny of the Prince Imperial.

The notion that Moses and the prophets were only astute men who by large discernment of human affairs, were able to foretell what should happen centuries afterwards, is not only absolutely gratuitous, but it is opposed to all experience of men. There are probably as astute men living in our day as in any age, and where is the man that can tell us a day ahead what shall be? On the natural discernment theory, there ought to be better prophets now than at any time, because there is so much larger a stock of human experience to go by than at any former time. But in point of fact, there is not the least ability anywhere to foretell the future. The future is a dead wall to the human eye. No man can forecast even the markets for a day ahead, let alone political destinies which are so peculiarly liable to unknown contingency. This inability to penetrate the future is appealed to in the Scriptures as the evidence of imposture on the part of those in Israel who falsely pretended to be divine. The challenge is put in this form: "Let them bring forth and *show us what shall happen* . . . SHOW THE THINGS THAT ARE TO COME HEREAFTER that we may know that ye are gods."—(Isa. 41:22-23). In contrast to this, we have the following declaration from God: "I am God, and there is none like me, *declaring*

the end from the beginning and from ancient times, *the things that are not yet done*, saying, my counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure." "Behold the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: BEFORE THEY SPRING FORTH, I TELL YOU OF THEM" (Isa. 46:9; 42:9). Moses and the prophets foretold the fate of the Jews thousands of years ahead, and also the leading developments of Gentile power in their relation to God's further purpose on earth. It cannot be said that the ability to do this was a Jewish faculty: for the Jews are as helpless today as their Gentile neighbours. They have had no prophets among them since God forsook them for their iniquities, and dispersed them through the countries. There is only one possible explanation of the prophecies in the case, and that is the explanation given by the prophets themselves, when they represent that God spoke to them what they said and wrote, and in that case, the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation.

MR. BRADLAUGH'S ARGUMENT

Mr. Bradlaugh simply evaded the issue, and sought to cover his retreat by a great outcry against the alleged prurient character of the Bible. This was sufficiently met in the debate. It is one of the proofs of the Bible's divinity that it speaks of things as they are without reference to human delicacies, which in most cases are a mere recoil from appearances not founded on an intrinsic aversion to wrong. Many minds easily shocked at a breach of human manners, are absolutely insensible to impressions of righteousness. The Bible deals with facts and truth; and if these may sometimes appear prurient, it is only because of the prurient fastidiousness of mankind, and not because of the use made of the facts. If the Bible ever makes delicate allusions, it is never in the spirit of lust, but always as a mere matter of literal and colourless fact. In this there is a vast difference between the Bible and other books with which Mr. Bradlaugh most unreasonably sought to class it. Shakespeare and Byron would have no fascination for prurient readers if their allusions were like the Bible's. Mr. Bradlaugh's inuendo would have more force against medical books than against the Bible: but the fact is, there is no reason in the objection whatever. It was one of several instances in which Mr. Bradlaugh's reckless logic allowed him to appear in the unnatural character of an indignant virtuoso against a book which, in spite of all his diatribes, teaches a virtue beyond the capacity of the majority of men to understand or appreciate.

The only other thing calling for notice is Mr. Bradlaugh's remark, that in the case of there having been a pre-Adamite race, Adam was not "the first man" which 1 Cor. 15:44 calls him. The answer is, first, the pre-Adamite race are not spoken of as man but as "the angels which sinned"¹ (2 Pet. 2:4), and that, therefore, there is no inconsistency in describing Adam as "the first *man*". And, secondly, even if the pre-Adamite race had been human, Adam was "the first man" of the present race, and as this is the sense in which Paul uses the phrase, it

¹ Publisher's Note: It is now generally accepted that Peter's reference is to the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. See *Wrested Scriptures*, p.180.

is in no way inconsistent with the pre-Adamite existence of another race of which he was not then speaking.

CONCLUSION.

The Review is now at an end. Mr. Roberts thanks Mr. Bradlaugh for permitting him to add to it the report of the discussion. Mr. Roberts has offered Mr. Bradlaugh the opportunity of writing a rejoinder to it for appearance in the same pamphlet, but Mr. Bradlaugh has not accepted the offer; and, therefore, the report and the review go forth without the reply from him that he might be able to give; but Mr. Bradlaugh has other means of letting his friends know his mind, of which he will, doubtless, avail himself should he consider it necessary to take notice of anything appearing herein.

It is only fair to Mr. Bradlaugh to add that as far as the report of the last three nights of the debate is concerned, he has not revised it, though offered the opportunity of doing so. He considers the reporting of that part of the debate badly done. In fact he stated this to be the reason for his declining the task of revision. The labour required, he said, would be too great to be accomplished within a reasonable time. It is right to say that the part of the debate in question was reported by a man appointed by Mr. Bradlaugh's own agent; and that the first half of the debate which Mr. Bradlaugh commended as well done, was reported for Mr. Hodgkinson, of Norman Cross, by Mr. Arthur Andrew, with Mr. Pulbrook, 28, Threadneedle Street, London.

**THE
HINE
DEBATE**

**— ARE
ENGLISHMEN
ISRAELITES?**

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE following report of a Three-Nights' Debate in Exeter Hall, Strand, London, is from the notes of shorthand-writers. Mr. Hine declined to share any risk in the publishing part of the enterprise, but consented to Mr. Roberts' friends doing as they pleased in the matter. The transcript of the shorthand-writers has been carefully revised and corrected by Mr. Roberts. Mr. Hine was offered the manuscript for the purpose of revising his part of the Debate; but he declined to avail himself of the opportunity. He said he had perfect confidence in Mr. Roberts' friends, and that his engagements would not allow him the necessary leisure to go over the manuscript. Consequently Mr. Hine's speeches appear without the advantage of personal revision by him. They are, however, faithfully and accurately reported, as all who heard them will bear witness.

A gentleman who heard the Debate, and who was originally inclined to accept Mr. Hine's views, said, "What does it matter which way it is? It seems to me a matter of indifference whether we are Israel or not. I do not see why it should be made a matter of such earnest controversy". As it is probable that this represents a very common sentiment on the subject, a word or two with reference to it may not be amiss. Such a sentiment is natural in the present posture of the public mind in Bible matters. If our future state is individually entered upon when we die, and has nothing to do with the earth upon which we live and its affairs, it certainly must matter very little, except as a question of curious interest, whether the English are the "lost ten tribes" or no. The perusal of the succeeding pages may possibly prepare the reader for a different view of this point. Though the subject is not expressly discussed (as it is in some other works issuing from the same source) it will be found to be suggested by the whole tenor of the argument, that the death state is not the state of spiritual destiny; that resurrection at the second appearing of Christ introduces to this; and that it has direct and peculiar reference to the purpose of God in connection with the nation of Israel, and therefore connected with affairs on earth in the judicial epoch and beyond.

When Jesus said, "Salvation is *of the Jews*" (John 4:22), and when Paul summoned the chief of the Jews at Rome on the ground that he was manacled "for the hope of Israel" (Acts 28:20), it was no accidental or figurative form of words they employed. The hope of the gospel is a hope so essentially Israelitish in its character and surroundings as to constitute Paul's declaration before Agrippa a natural statement of fact, viz.: "Now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, *unto which promise*, OUR TWELVE TRIBES instantly serving God day and night, *hope to come*" (Acts 26:6). There was no straining of language in the declaration he makes to the Romans (chap. 9:4) that

to the Israelites “pertain the adoption and the glory of the covenants * * * and the promises”. He establishes a direct connection between the work of Christ and these Israelitish hopes and promises, when he says (Romans 15:8) that “Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to *confirm the promises made unto the fathers*”.

The hope of the gospel being the hope of Israel (Acts 28:20; 1:6), it becomes a very important question, whether or not British greatness is the realization of that hope. If it be, then is the hope of Israel a poor affair, and little worth to those who sigh for deliverance from the multiform evils that afflict human life and human society everywhere, and as much in Britain as anywhere else. Anglo-Israelism asks us to regard the House of Brunswick as the House of David, and the kingdom of Great Britain as the kingdom of Israel in the promised exaltation and blessedness. Let this view be accepted, and two results follow: The mind (already sufficiently predisposed by nature) is drawn into a loving alliance with the godless world of British society, and into all the demoralising results that come from such an alliance; while the truly “glorious things spoken of Zion” are eclipsed, and lose all power to influence a man to those present self-denials which the hope of Israel exacts as the condition-precendent of reigning with Christ, when the “present evil world” shall be a vision of the past.

The Hine theory is a mockery. It is a sham and a cheat for all spiritual purposes. It puts off with hollow words the soul that thirsts for the good things promised to Israel. The God of Israel has asked all such to hearken diligently to Him, to eat that which is good, to let their souls delight themselves in fatness, to have a part in the sure mercies of David (Isaiah 55:1-3). What those sure mercies are is known to those who know the Scriptures. Hineism comes forward with British greatness as the sum and substance of them all. What is British greatness to the man who longs for what God has promised to Israel?—who longs to see Divine light upon earth, Divine law enforced, property Divinely distributed, society Divinely constructed, individual life Divinely formed, national life Divinely regulated, physical life Divinely renovated, evil in every form Divinely repressed, and death itself at last abolished? British greatness! What is it? The triumph of unscrupulous might, the success of unprincipled commerce, the prosperity of intolerant pride, the deft management of men and ships in the art of human destruction, the skilful use of mechanics and the subtle employment of intellect in self-aggrandisement, the picturesque and vain-glorious ostentation of caste, the ignominious ease of a few at the sacrifice of the best interests of toiling millions who scarcely know how to subsist, and who have none of the alleviating opportunities and influences which a just distribution of earth’s teeming wealth would ensure for all.

What was the characteristic of Israel’s national life, and Israel’s royal house in the day of their power? The presence and interference of God in their midst for purposes of law and government in the most practical shape. Moses gave expression to the idea in his question: “What nation is there so great who hath

God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for?" (Deut. 4:7). The practical sense in which this was the case is illustrated in the Divine decision of a question of family inheritance (Num. 27:5-7), and the direction of how to deal with an unprovided-for-case of blasphemy (Lev. 24:12-14). In the re-constitution of the nation of Israel — in the re-building of the tabernacle of David that is fallen: the glory of the era ensuing consists of the restoration of this feature in a more direct and personal form than it ever presented under the first covenant. Instead of a dread presence in a typical tabernacle, a son of David — the Lord Jesus Christ — is to occupy the throne in their midst, as the personal symbol and administrator (through His agents) of Divine and irresistible law. "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. * * * He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, neither shall He judge after the hearing of His ears: But with righteousness shall He judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked" (Isaiah 11:2-4). Those who desire evidence that He will occupy the throne of David personally, have but to consult the following passages:—Luke 1:32, Isaiah 9:6; Jer. 23:5, Psa. 132:11, Acts 2:30; 2 Sam. 23:5, Micah 5:2; Zech. 6:12-13. "The Lord the King of Israel is in their midst" in that day (Zeph. 3:15). Thus the "law goes forth from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isaiah 2:3), with the result that all nations walk in the light of it, and abandon the evil traditions of the present barbarised state of society (Jer. 3:17; 16:12). His government is personal government, of the most absolute character, administered through His resurrected and immortal friends. A rod of iron, wielded in Jerusalem with consummate wisdom and irresistible power, will bring all nations into subjection to a Divine autocracy that will bless universal man with true government and endow the nations with every institution required by individual and social welfare.

From this glorious prospect — from this needed and promised salvation, Anglo-Israelism turns the mind utterly away. It directs us to the hollow state of things around us from which we require to be delivered. It asks us to recognise the promised greatness of Israel in the tramp of British soldiers, the prowess of British ironclads, the jangle of British parliaments, the mummery of British ecclesiasticism, and the colonial appropriations of British acquisitiveness. There is nothing Divine in the British constitution, except in so far as it is a tolerated and occultly regulated institution for ulterior Divine ends. It is a purely and intensely human affair, unlike the government of Israel, which was, and is again to be, proximately and visibly Divine. In pointing us to such a thing, Anglo-Israelism for bread gives us a stone. The discussion may be useful as illustrating the fact. At all events it is sent forth with the simple aim which led to the discussion — a desire to draw attention to the much-belauded, but everywhere-neglected Book of God;

which is not understood by reason of the universal acceptance of a false theology, which renders its glorious doctrines of none effect.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Birmingham, May 2nd, 1879.

ARE ENGLISHMEN ISRAELITES?

Time table each Evening.

Mr. HINE. Speech, Thirty Minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Speech, Thirty Minutes.

Mr. HINE to question Mr. Roberts, Fifteen Minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS to question Mr. Hine, Fifteen Minutes.

Mr. HINE to question Mr. Roberts or make a Speech, Fifteen Minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS to question Mr. Hine or make a Speech, Fifteen Minutes.

The remainder of the time up to ten o'clock to be equally divided in Speeches by Mr. Hine and Mr. Roberts.

FIRST NIGHT.

THE CHAIRMAN (LORD WILLIAM LENNOX):— Ladies and Gentlemen, Some little experience as a lecturer has convinced me that a chairman best fulfils his duties who occupies as little as possible of the time of the audience. I should therefore have addressed you very briefly, but I find that in my instructions I am limited to ten minutes. Now ten minutes will give me ample time to tell you what I have to say. In the first place you are here this evening to listen to a discussion between Mr. Edward Hine and Mr. Robert Roberts. These gentlemen are limited to a certain time, and it will be my unpleasant duty to stop them if, in the height of their argument, they are carried on beyond the limits allowed to them; but I am quite sure that it will not be the case. I have my watch ready, and will give them warning at three minutes before the time expires, but I am quite sure, so able are these gentlemen as disputants or lecturers, that I shall not be called upon to interfere with them. I have only to add that the duty of a chairman is

to see that everything is conducted properly, and I am quite sure that everything will be conducted on the fair English principle of a fair field and no favour. I need only say this, that I am certain that you will listen to these two gentlemen with every attention, and I am instructed to say to you that no discussion from any member of the audience will be permitted. We are to hear these two gentlemen, and to form our opinions on what they state. With these few remarks I beg to call upon Mr. Hine to commence the proceedings of the evening.

A VOICE:—How is this question to be decided at the end of the discussion? Is it to be decided on a show of hands, or otherwise?

THE CHAIRMAN:—There is to be no decision.

Mr. EDWARD HINE:—My Lord, and ye Children of Israel (and I would not give up the point for any consideration, unless the Lord God Almighty came forth with clearer proofs than I have now obtained upon that matter),—Our object is to meet to consider the deep things of God, and if we be right then we lay before your consideration a subject that can be second unto no subject on earth, as far as man is concerned. If we are enabled to show to the people of London — as we have to the people in the North — that you are identical with the people of Israel, then the whole future of your country is made known to you, and legislation becomes easy to your legislators.

God Almighty of old times selected one nation from the midst of all other nations,—a separate nation,—*i.e.*, one nation to be unto Him a peculiar nation; a chosen people, severed and separated from all the other peoples of the earth. I read in my Bible to this effect: “And I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee” (Gen. 17:7). “And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear a son indeed: and thou shalt call his name Isaac, and I will establish My Covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him” (Gen. 17:19). “Sarah said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham’s sight, because of his son. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee hearken unto her voice, for in Isaac shall thy seed be called” (Gen. 21:10-12). “And it came to pass after the death of Abraham, that God blessed his son Isaac” (Gen. 25:11). “God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth” (Deut. 7:6). “Thou shalt be blessed above all people” (Deut. 7:14). “Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day” (Deut. 10:15). “The Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth” (Deut. 14:2). “The Lord hath avouched thee (*i.e.*, Israel) this day to be His peculiar people, as He hath promised thee, and

that thou shouldest keep all His commandments; and to make thee high above all the nations (*i.e.*, the Gentile nations) which He hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou (*i.e.*, Israel) mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, as He hath spoken" (Deut. 26:18-19). "The Lord thy God will set thee on high above all the nations of the earth" (Deut. 28:1). "Above all", *i.e.*, above the Gentile nations of the earth" "For their (*i.e.*, the Gentiles) rock is not as our (*i.e.*, the Israelitish) Rock, even our enemies (the Gentiles) themselves being judges" (Deut. 32:31). "What one nation in the earth is like thy people, whom God went to redeem for a people unto Himself. For Thou didst separate them (*i.e.*, Israel) from among all the people of the earth (*i.e.*, from among the Gentiles), to be Thine inheritance" (1 Kings 8:53). "What one nation in the earth is like Thy people Israel, whom God went to redeem to be His own people, to make thee a name of greatness and terribleness, by driving out nations from before Thy people, whom Thou hast reeemed out of Egypt. For Thy people Israel didst Thou make Thine own people for ever" (1 Chron. 17:21, 22). "His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law * * * then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless My lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail" (Psalm 89:30-33). "The children of Thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before Thee" (Psalm 102:28). "For the Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure" (Psalm 135:4). "He hath not dealt so with any nation (*i.e.*, with any other Gentile nation); and as for His judgments, they (*i.e.*, the Gentiles) have not known them. Praise ye the Lord" (Psalm 147:20). "The Lord exalteth the horn of His people (*i.e.*, Israel), the praise of all His saints; even of the children of Israel, a people near unto Him. Praise ye the Lord" (Psalm 148:14).

The Scriptures that we have read, and there are many that we have skipped, declare by the Word of God that His people, the seed of Abraham, shall exist before the Almighty a separate seed — a distinct and severed nation — distinct and separate from the Gentile peoples, God giving His assurance, and making His covenant by a condescension on the part of the Lord, swearing that what He hath said would come to pass—that this seed should be a peculiar seed, a separated seed, a national seed, distinct and separated from all the Gentile sects of the earth; not for a short space of time, but for ever, until the world shall be consumed. So that taking these Scriptures again and again multiplied, we are bound, in my judgment, to believe that until the end of the world shall be, until time shall pass away, until then the seed of Israel must exist a distinct and national seed, until we verge upon the precincts of eternity; and as we all know we have not yet entered upon the matters of eternity, so taking the word of God—my God—I am bound to believe that this seed still exists separate from all the other seeds of the earth.

But after they went into their captivity He then turns His back upon them, as we see. As showing that God Almighty never broke His oath, that they are exiled

from their land and go forth to their captivity, we have these Scriptures: "But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend" (Isaiah 41:8). "Return for Thy servants' sake, the tribes of Thine inheritance. The people of Thy Holiness have possessed it but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down Thy sanctuary. We are Thine: Thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by Thy name" (Isaiah 63:17-19). "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau" (Mal. 1:2-3). "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them saying, * * * Go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel" (Matt. 10:5-6). "He hath holpen His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy; as He spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever" (Luke 1:54-55). "Jesus saw Nathanael coming to Him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" (John 1:47). "Then said the Jews among themselves, Whither will He go, that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?" (John 7:35). "That He would give it to him (Abraham) for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child" (Acts 7:5).

We have many more words from God declaring that the seed of Israel should exist as a nation before Him, separate from the other peoples of the earth. God Almighty declaring by covenant that they shall exist for ever, I am bound to believe, and should be very sorry to disbelieve, that the seed of Abraham, the nation of Israel, does now exist as a distinct and separate people from all the other nations of the earth. Hence our object in this little matter of discussion and debate, which by no means can come to the proportion of a great debate; but the object of our debate is to prove that we know that God has kept His word, because we know we can lay our hands upon this seed that God has separated from all the other nations of the earth. But then remembering, and we must do so, having this firmly lodged in the mind, that God declares of the seed of Israel — the nation of Israel after their long captivity — that so long as there be the sun, and so long as there be the moon, so long as there be the day and the night, so long should the seed of Israel exist before Him as a nation, we are bound to believe it. The seed of Israel becomes this very night a nation, a chosen people, distinct and separate from all other nations, and having that firmly lodged in the mind, it really is the key-note to the whole of our discussion. When He required the seed of Abraham, the twelve-tribe people, to be divided into two parts, the two families whom the Lord should bless, Almighty God declared He had broken the bands between Israel and Judah, declaring He had formed one vessel for honour, and the other for dishonour. Then we have to ask ourselves is the Word of God to be fulfilled, because if as Almighty God required one seed to be recognised—*i.e.*, one division of the family to be known, whereas the other division of the same family was to be unknown,—they were to be called by another name, the ten-tribe people. God declared He would hedge in their field that they should not find their way, that they should become the lost people, and we have that to fix upon the mind, that God requires the people to be separate, and yet one branch of the same people in after days to become lost.

We declare and tell you that the ten-tribe people never returned from Babylon with the two-tribe people the second time. We declare that from the scores of Scriptures which are to be found; hence, if you say the people of Israel have returned, then what? God declared through Amos that when the second-time return has taken place they shall no more again be pulled out of their land. Let us say the return has taken place, because this is an important point; as I would fully grant that if the second-time return has taken place, then the ten-tribe people must be allied to and in connection with the two-tribe people of Judah. But God Almighty declared that when the second-time return shall take place they shall no more be pulled out of their land. God cannot lie: therefore if that return had taken place, then the people would not have been pulled up once more again out of their land. God declared that should never be after the second-time return had taken place; hence to say it had taken place would be to give the lie to God, because He has told you over and over again that when the second-time return shall take place, sin and sorrow should flee from His people, and that they shall not go forth to mourn. But the people who returned at the time of Babylon went back to cry, to sob, to mourn, and in a state of mourning that they had never known before. God declares that there is an end to their sighing and suffering when the second-time return shall take place. God declares He will stretch forth His hand to recover the outcasts of Israel, and He will with His mighty hand cause them to go over dry-shod. There shall be another dividing of waters, because it shall be like as it was to Israel in the days when they came up out of Egypt. When the Jews returned from Babylon there was no dividing of waters to Israel and Judah. God declared there should be another dividing of waters, a miracle, because it shall be like as it was to Israel in the days when they came forth from Egypt. So that if we say the Jews have returned a third time, we cast the lie to Almighty God. Hence we see it becomes very dangerous to say that the return the second time has already been accomplished, because you see by scores of instances we can produce, God Almighty declaring certain things. We tie ourselves to the Word of God, and we declare that the Lord could not lie. We should not have the suspicion, we should not give birth even to the thought, that the Lord might vary from His word; and these things not having come to pass we assert, and boldly assert, in the interests of God Almighty, and as servants of His word boldly declare, that the second-time return has not taken place. (Applause.)

If you would kindly dispense with applause, and allow me to go smoothly on, I should much prefer it. Then, if you say this, the seed of Israel must be quite distinct, they must be existing separately, and must be the lost people biding the time when the Lord will recover them, because then shall the second-time return take place. And that is why we meet together this night, declaring that the second-time return has not yet taken place, is yet to take place. Hence the people must now be a lost people, in obscurity, in darkness, and only waiting the hand of Almighty God to go forth from their hiding when this return shall take place, and when the return has taken place, a Christian people, a godly people, loving their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Why, when this return shall

take place we shall come forth as an evidence to the truth of the Word of God, because we shall be able to lay our finger on every event that prophecy declares shall come to pass,—upon this event, upon the other, and so forth, each one of which shall prove that what the Lord has said that has He brought to pass. Hence we see it becomes exceedingly important that you see the people separated from the Gentile nations, that you say that they never returned the second time, because saying that it leads you again to see the third point, and a very important point,—that the people are in hiding, in obscurity, that they have yet to be recovered and brought forth.

I must draw to a close for my half-hour is gone. We shall have plenty of time; there is no need to hurry: all that we ask is that you should be patient. We are dealing with the things of God, and we are dealing with the most important matter that can come before the consideration of the British people. Before I sit down, I declare to you my own belief is that no other nation upon earth could comply with the prophecy, and correspond to the circumstances with which God has surrounded the Children of Israel, but the British people. (Applause.)

Mr. ROBERT ROBERTS:—My Lord, Mr. Hine, Ladies and Gentlemen,— It would be a very pleasant thing to be able to second Mr. Hine's argument, and to maintain that the British people are the modern representatives of God's ancient nation of Israel, and the heirs of all the privileges that are guaranteed in so many ways to that distinguished people. It would be a pleasure to maintain such a proposition, if it could be maintained in accordance with truth. In judging of truth in such a question we must have our eye upon the evidence, and it is to be evidence that I should wish to-night to direct your attention. We have not had much evidence in the remarks that have been made.

That God has chosen Israel to be a special and distinct people to Himself, I admit; and that they are yet to be restored "a second time" to their own land, I also admit; but the question is, where are they now? Are they in dispersion or collection? Are they a scattered race, or do they exist as a great and powerful nation? Are they to be found in all countries, without political form, or are they gathered together as a great and independent people in the British Islands? Mr. Hine says they are in the last described portion, but assertion is not evidence unless the asserter have authority to assert. I do not presume that Mr. Hine claims the authority to establish by his own *ipse dixit* what is truth in this or any other matter; I presume he professes to found his conceptions upon this subject upon Bible declarations. We have not had much of this kind of argument. I do not complain of that exactly, because it is Mr. Hine's opening address, and it was not possible, perhaps, to make very clearly distinct to the mind any very powerful arguments in the brief time at his disposal. Nay, I will go further, and say—and I speak within the bounds of demonstrable truth when I say it—that if he occupy six whole evenings, he will not be able to develop an argument that will appeal to the logical faculty, and that will resist the critical proceedings to which it will be my duty to

subject it. This is virtually the view entertained by an authority upon his side of the question, a gentleman of some standing, who has expressed an opinion upon this point. I do not know whether he be a friend of Mr. Hine or no; it is a matter of little consequence. Bishop Titcombe, who believes that the English people are the ancient Israel in their modern form, says in his published and very clever book, entitled *The Anglo-Israel Post Bag*, as follows:—

“The evidence is not actual demonstration, but it is submitted that the opinion is neither unreasonable nor visionary; and until a better theory can be propounded, it is worthy of our fullest belief.”

I would not stand here this evening if I were not prepared to maintain that a better theory exists — a theory that does not stultify historical facts — a theory that does not outrage every human probability — a theory that does not require prodigious ingenuity in squaring facts and Scripture in harmony with it — a theory which recognises in the fullest and most obvious sense the declarations concerning God’s purposes with the House of Israel, and which find their natural fulfilment in the future restoration of the scattered race, in both houses, from all countries, to their own land, there to occupy a position of sovereignty over all other nations as a monarchy under the promised son of David, whose appearance in the world is an already accomplished fact, though meanwhile he is for a time absent. To this fullest and most obvious fulfilment of all the declarations to which Mr. Hine has referred, it will be my duty to call your attention, as affording the completest refutation of his ideas about Britain.

Before doing so, and in order to pave the way for a satisfactory canvass of the subject, I must recall to your mind a few simple historical facts with which presumably the bulk of the present company must be acquainted, I mean Biblical historical facts — the facts to which Mr. Hine has dimly alluded in his Scripture quotations, but which he has not developed before us with the distinctness and continuousness to enable you to see to what they all refer. I recall your recollection to the origin of the Jewish nation, and I will use the term as comprehensive of the twelve tribes, although, perhaps, on reconsideration it would be wise of me not to use a term to which Mr. Hine might take exception; therefore I will say, the Israelitish nation as comprehending its Jewish element as well, for Mr. Hine will not attempt to deny that the Jews are an element at least of the great Israelitish people, whom God has hitherto used as the instruments of His providential designs in the history of the world, and whom it is His purpose to use in a far more effective manner in the future. I will not speak of Abraham, I will not speak of Isaac, the immediate predecessors of Jacob, because Jacob is the one personage who stands before us, as far as the present discussion is concerned, as the individual representative of the whole nation that afterwards occupied the Holy Land under the law of Moses.

You are aware that he had twelve sons; that these twelve sons multiplied in separate families, that these separate families under circumstances which you

probably know, and which at all events it is not necessary to refer to in detail, went down into Egypt; that they, after the lapse of some centuries, when they had multiplied into a great community, were taken out of Egypt by many wonderful manifestations of Divine power by the hand of Moses, under whose leadership they started for the occupation of the land promised to their fathers, at that time in the occupation of the powerful Amorite nation, now known upon the face of the earth as the Land of Palestine, long desolate under Turkish barbarism, but now awaking to a new life. During their short progress to that country, they were delayed under circumstances interesting, but not necessary to consider. While delayed in the wilderness they received the law, and they were organised into a nationality of twelve divisions. By-and-bye, under the law, they entered the Land of Promise, subduing the nations which occupied it. They occupied the land in their stead as a commonwealth — not a monarchy — as a divinely governed realm under divinely appointed judges. For some centuries that state of things continued, until David (after Saul) was given as the monarch of the whole nation. David reigned forty years, and Solomon reigned forty years after him. Immediately succeeding to Solomon comes the national event that gives rise more particularly to the argument which Mr. Hine may, probably in the course of this discussion, elaborate somewhat more distinctly than he has yet done — the argument which seeks to identify the British race with the lost ten tribes. The event I refer to was the revolt of a large part of the nation from their allegiance to the throne of David, as occupied by Rehoboam, Solomon's son; and the formation of the revolted section, constituting the larger section, viz.: ten of the twelve tribes, into an independent monarchy under Jeroboam, one of Solomon's servants. That independent, separated, revolted section retained a national independence for about 300 years, and was then broken up, the people being taken away out of the country by the Assyrian invader, and the question, what became of them, we shall by-and-by have to consider.

Meanwhile we will say good-bye to them, so to speak, at this point — at the time when they were taken away by Shalmaneser to regions beyond the river Euphrates. The remaining section of the original kingdom of David consisting of two tribes — Judah and Benjamin — continued to exist in the land as an independent nationality for about 150 years after the deportation of the ten tribes into Assyria. At the end of that time they also were taken captives by another power — Babylon, under Nebuchadnezzar. The bulk of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were taken to Babylon. There was a partial return from Babylon, and a re-settlement in the land in seventy years; and after a while the re-establishment of national independence a second time under Judah Maccabaeus, as you may recollect. The independence thus regained continued to exist, in a certain modified form, lastly under the Romans, until the days of Christ.

Jewish history, so far as Jewish nationality is concerned, culminated in the appearance of the great Light of the World. Jesus, the son of David, as well as the Son of God (Matthew 1:1) told the people of the Jews, among whom He appeared, that upon that generation would come the accumulated guilt of

generations, and that God would send upon them a great military nation who would break their power, overthrow Jerusalem, reduce the land to desolation, destroy the bulk of the nation, and take them into captivity. That fearful prediction, made also ages before by Moses, came to pass, as you are aware. Vespasian, and then Titus, to whom he transferred the command on being called to the Imperial purple, desolated the whole country of Judea, reduced their fortified places, laid siege to Jerusalem and conducted without exception, the bloodiest and most destructive siege ever known in the history of mankind. From that day to this the Jewish race has been in the position described by all the prophets, and particularly by Christ in His prediction of these events, *i.e.*, they have been scattered abroad as exiles, they have been wanderers, they have been objects of contempt and persecution.

That is a brief history of the whole nation, and what I want now to call attention to is the principle underlying that history, which excludes the very possibility of the British nation being any section of that broken nation of Israel. In order to develop this principle I recall you again to the wilderness, into which the whole assembly of twelve tribes were taken by Moses, and I invite you to consider the nature of the transaction by which their nationality was constituted. It was a covenant of agreement on two sides — the nation on the one side, the God of their fathers on the other; and I will read to you the terms of that covenant, and then ask you to consider the application of these terms in the subsequent history of the nation. In the 19th chapter of the Book of Exodus Moses is commanded by God to say as we read in the third verse:

“Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the Children of Israel, ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto Myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.”

“If ye will hearken unto Me” — what was their response? At the eighth verse you will find that: “All the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.” Upon which Moses took back the answer of the people, and then received an extensive communication of God’s requirements in the national existence. In the course of these communications we find some statements to which I now particularly direct your attention. When Moses had delivered in an elaborate form all these statutes and the arrangements under which they were to occupy the land as a nation, he then said to them as found in the 28th chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy:

“It shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all His commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God.” And then he proceeds to enumerate a long line of blessings that were to be realised to them contingently upon their observance of what God commanded them. Many of these blessings are the blessings which Mr. Hine quotes detached for their context, as if they were absolute promises concerning a nation now to be found somewhere amongst the Gentile nations; whereas they are blessings limited to the people who were spoken to by Moses at the time, and expressly conditional upon their obedience. This is made unmistakeably evident by the other side of the case being put — *i.e.*, we are told what the result would be if they were disobedient. These results are very plainly put in the 26th chapter of Leviticus. I will read verses 14, 16, 17, 25, 33, 36-39:

“But if ye will not hearken unto Me, and will not do all these commandments * * * I also will do this unto you: I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it. And I will set my face against you, and ye shall fall before your enemies: they shall hate you and reign over you; and ye shall flee when none pursueth you, * * * And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of My covenant: and when ye are gathered in your cities I will send a pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy. * * * *And I will scatter you, and I will draw out a sword after you, and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste. * * * And upon them that are left alive of you, I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies;* and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee as fleeing from a sword; and they shall flee when none pursueth. And they shall fall one upon another, as it were before a sword, when none pursueth: and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies. And ye shall perish among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies’ lands; and also in the iniquity of their fathers shall they pine away with them.”

I would ask you to read also the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, and the 29th and 31st chapters also. I will read an extract from the 31st chapter, for this reason, that we have in this chapter a prophetic intimation to Moses by God, concerning the futurity of the people to whom he was making these contingent declarations; he was informed how the thing would turn out in the actual event. We read at verse 16 (chapter 31): “The Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and this people will rise up, and go a-whoring after the gods of the

strangers of the land, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake Me and break My covenant which I have made with them. Then My anger shall be kindled against them in that day, *and I will forsake them, and I will hide My face from them*, and they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them; so that they will say in that day, Are not these evils come upon us because our God is not among us? And I will surely hide My face in that day for all the evils which they shall have wrought, in that they are turned unto other gods. Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it the Children of Israel: *put it in their mouths, that this song may be* A WITNESS FOR ME AGAINST THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL.”

Now I advise you to read the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy; it is God’s prophetic testimony against Israel—a declaration beforehand of what the course of their national history would be. I will not read it to-night, as it would take too long to do so, but you will find it answers the very purpose that is here described. It is a witness against them, in what way? You will find it does not compliment them by predicting great and good things for them; it does not speak smooth things to them. It records evil things of them, the whole pith of which may be said to be condensed into these few verses, which I will read—from verses 22 to 25: “A fire is kindled in Mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them: I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction: I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust. The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also with the man of gray hairs.”

Now with regard to these predictions, which you will perceive were delivered at the very beginning of the national existence, this has to be said, that *they applied equally to the ten tribes as to the two*, for they were delivered to the twelve, and concerned the twelve in all these particulars; consequently, both the two and the ten-tribed sections must be in desolation together, from which it follows that England cannot be the ten tribes in prosperity while Judah is in affliction. Let me show you how that reasonable, nay, irresistible deduction is borne out by the history of the case. I will take you to the ten tribes, and then to the two, and show you that in both cases these curses have been realised. The prophecy requires that all of them shall be scattered and subject to evil during the time of their banishment, instead of having risen to the position of a great nation, like the British nation. (Applause.)

And this remark, if it has any force, has more force against the ten than against the two; if there is any difference between the kingdom of the ten tribes and the kingdom of the two, it is a difference decidedly in favour of the two, and against the ten. You may ask, How is that? Why, if you take the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes, you will find that that history—brief though it is, extending to only about 300 years, up to the time of the deportation, that history is a dark

history, unrelieved by a single gleam of loyalty to the Divine requirements delivered by Moses. The whole of the eighteen or nineteen kings that sat upon the throne erected by Jeroboam were, one and all of them, idolators, who led the nation away from the commands of God. Whereas, in the kingdom of the two tribes, if you consider the history of the succession of monarchs that reigned over them from Rehoboam to Zedekiah, you will find many bright and glorious reigns. There are Hezekiah, Josiah, Jehoshaphat, and others who will occur to those who are acquainted with Scriptural history. And you will find there is a distinct recognition of this difference between the two kingdoms in the Scriptural records and allusions to their respective peculiarities. This distinction began at the very foundation of the kingdom of the ten tribes. You will find the statement made when Jeroboam established a false worship amongst the ten tribes, in the Second Book of Chronicles, chapter 11, verses 13, 14, 16: "The priests and the Levites that were in all Israel resorted to him (Rehoboam) out of all their coasts, for the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem. * * * And after them *out of all the tribes of Israel* SUCH AS SET THEIR HEARTS TO SEEK THE LORD GOD OF ISRAEL came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers." That is, the God-fearing part of the ten tribes separated themselves from the ten tribes, and identified themselves with the two; so that the kingdom of the two was a godly kingdom, while the kingdom of the ten was abandoned to idolatry.

You will find the godless and unrecognised character of the ten tribes strikingly illustrated in an incident recorded in the Second Book of Chronicles, chapter 19, verse 2. Jehoshaphat had made a temporary alliance with Ahab, the king of the ten tribes, and upon his return to Jerusalem he was met by a prophet of God, who says: "Shouldest thou help *the ungodly*, and love *them that hate the Lord*?" Still more pointed is the declaration in the Second Book of Chronicles, chapter 25 verse 7. The king of Judah had hired 100,000 soldiers from the king of the ten tribes, and a prophet came to the king and said: "Let not the army of Israel go with thee; for *THE LORD IS NOT WITH ISRAEL, to wit, with all the children of Ephraim.* * * * And the king said, But what shall we do for the hundred talents which I have given to the army of Israel? And the man of God answered, The Lord is able to give thee much more than this." So he sent them away, and these disappointed soldiers spread havoc and desolation in the northern parts of the kingdom of Judah. You will also find in the prophetic allusions, such instances as these: "Though thou, Israel, play the harlot, yet *let not Judah offend*" (Hosea 4:15). Ephraim compasseth me about with lies, and the House of Israel with deceit; but *Judah ruleth yet with God, and is faithful with the saints*" (Hosea 11:12).

In harmony with the state of the case illustrated by these facts, you next find that the threatened judgment of God, in vindication of His broken covenant,

came *first upon the ten tribes*, for the reason I will now read to you, in a declaration of Scripture concerning the reason of the captivity of the ten tribes, and the circumstances under which these ten tribes were exiled; from which declaration alone you will be able to deduce that, if there were no other evidence, it is a matter of impossibility that a nation in the position of England could be the descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel. Here, in the Second Book of Kings, in the 18th chapter, at the 11th verse, you will find THE LAW OF MOSES particularly mentioned as the basis of their condemnation: "And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel (*i.e.*, the ten tribes) unto Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes: because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord their God, but transgressed His covenant, and *all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded*, and would not hear them, nor do them". What happened to them in consequence of that? Go to 2 Kings 17:20: "The Lord rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hands of the spoilers, until He had cast them out of His sight." (Applause.)

Mr. HINE:—Dear friends, I have had many letters from all parts of the country, asking if a report of this debate would be published in any paper. We are not only speaking to the people now before us, but it is very evident we are speaking before the country. (Applause.) Hence I am going to ask Mr. Roberts, for really he has the whole matter in his hands, if he is aware of any papers, or any other means by which a report of this debate will go forth to the country?

Mr. ROBERTS:—I may say in answer to that question, that I am not aware of any paper that will report the discussion, but it is being reported on private behoof for separate publication in pamphlet form afterwards. (Applause.)

MR. HINE QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

1.—May I ask Mr. Roberts if, in his judgment, he would believe God has separated the people of Israel from all the other nations of the earth for ever?—Yes.

2.—Might I ask Mr. Roberts if the promises that he has been quoting, whereby God gave certain stipulations, conditional promises to the people of Israel, were given to the twelve tribes or the ten?—To the twelve.

3.—Then might I ask Mr. Roberts if God Almighty had given these promises to the twelve tribes, they were afterwards or previously divided?—Afterwards.

4.—Then I will ask Mr. Roberts, these promises being given to the twelve tribes unitedly, if afterwards God had divided this people, He did not give certain promises to the two, and contrary promises to the ten?—No.

5.—Then might I ask Mr. Roberts, after the division of the two peoples, the ten tribes from the two, can he produce any promise given by God Almighty, whereby He fixes certain promises to the two, and certain to the ten?—The ten are

mentioned separately; the two are mentioned separately, in prophecies coming after the division, but the blessings in both sets of promises are the same.

6.—Would Mr. Roberts suppose that the promises given in Deuteronomy would apply equally, after the division had been made, to the two tribes and to the ten?—As to the blessings, the conditions of the blessings having been breached, No.

7.—Would Mr. Roberts conceive that after the promise pronounced in Deuteronomy after the promise given to Abraham that his seed in after days should become a great nation, could that promise be, by the breach of the conditions, cancelled?—I believe the promises of God made to Abraham could not be cancelled by any power in heaven or earth.

8.—Believing that God Almighty made a covenant, and an everlasting covenant, and that these covenants, these oaths, could not be broken, does Mr. Roberts believe that God has broken His oath?—I do not.

9.—If God Almighty has decreed that the ten tribes should be separated from the two, and that the one should be under certain blessings and the other under certain curses, could any after circumstance alter the mind of God?—I deny that God ever said anything to that effect to Abraham or anybody else.

10.—Would Mr. Roberts conceive or believe, when God declares of a certain people that no weapon formed against them should prosper, that that promise could, after the separation, apply to both the houses?—I believe that promise applies to both houses of Israel in their final re-union under Christ.

11.—If, when God Almighty declares no weapon formed against a certain house should prosper, does Mr. Roberts believe that to apply to the Jewish people?—If Mr. Hine will define what he means by the Jewish people I will answer.

12.—Does Mr. Roberts believe in the separation of the ten tribes from the two?—Yes.

13.—Will he tell us his definition of the two tribes of the house of Judah?—The house of Judah as distinct from the ten tribes which constituted the house of Israel. But they are all Jews, as I shall show afterwards.

14.—Mr. Roberts told us that he acknowledged there is existing at the present time a division between the ten tribes and the two; will he tell us what tribes are comprised in the house of Judah?—The house of Judah, when it existed in the land as a nation, I presume Mr. Hine understands, consisted of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi.

15.—Does Mr. Roberts suppose that it comprises any other tribe but these three?—I should not.

16.—Does Mr. Roberts believe in these days the tribe of Benjamin to be connected with the house of Judah?—I do.

17.—Would Mr. Roberts suppose that Jeremiah 6:1 has been complied with? I will read it: “O ye children of Benjamin, gather yourselves to flee out of the midst of Jerusalem”. Would Mr. Roberts suppose that that Scripture has yet to be complied with?—It was a command given, which, like a great many other commands was disobeyed.

18.—Can Mr. Roberts supply us with any proofs that this command has been disobeyed?—Yes, I can.

19.—In what way can Mr. Roberts bring forth proofs?—By calling attention first to the date of this prophecy, which was a few years before the Babylonian captivity, and reminding Mr. Hine of the fact that when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem the inhabitants of Jerusalem had not fled, but were in it; and the inhabitants of Jerusalem were the children of Benjamin, *i.e.*, a part of them, because Jerusalem was a city of Benjamin (Josh. 18:21, 28). Of course, there were many of the children of Benjamin spread about the country, the bulk of Benjamin being outside Jerusalem.

20.—At what time Mr. Roberts?—At the time I speak of, just before the Babylonish captivity.

21.—Before the Babylonish captivity, or after the Babylonish captivity?—Before the Babylonish captivity. After the captivity a few of the poor of the land were left, but the inhabitants of Jerusalem were taken in the bulk to Babylon. If they had obeyed the command of the prophet, they would not have been taken captive, for it was a command to the inhabitants of Jerusalem to get out of it and go over to the forces of the king of Babylon, with a promise that if they complied they would be exempted from death (Jer. 38:2). Jeremiah attempted to go and was stopped by one of the sentinels of the gate (Jer. 37:12, 13). Perhaps Mr. Hine recollects that?

22.—He does not recollect that Jeremiah wanted to go to Babylon.—No, but to get out of Jerusalem.

23.—Did the tribe of Benjamin, or any portion of them, go to Babylon?—Yes, a portion.

24.—Mr. Roberts has told us that the tribe of Benjamin now is allied to the Jewish people; hence, if the tribe of Benjamin is allied at the present time to the House of Judah, how many tribes would be left of the House of Israel?—When?

25.—Now?—The number that were taken away.

26.—How many would that be?—Ten.

27.—Then there would be ten tribes connected with the House of Israel, and there would be three tribes connected with the House of Judah?—Yes, that is correct, understanding that Levi was separated for the priesthood.

28.—Then there would be thirteen tribes connected with the twelve-tribe people of Israel?—Yes, because one was split into two.

29.—My dear friends, you really do not believe that, do you? Would Mr. Roberts suppose that this one tribe, cut into two parts, would consist of, or make, two tribes?—Yes, that was settled by the power dividing them. I have the proof.

30.—Did this one tribe, divided into two parts, go forth two distinct tribes?—I do not quite understand that question, Mr. Hine.

31.—What tribe was divided into two parts?—The tribe of Joseph.

32.—Can Mr. Roberts supply, or tell us, what Scriptural proofs he has that the tribe of Joseph was separated into two parts?—Yes, I can.

33.—Will he do so?—I will. It is in the 14th chapter of Joshua, where there is an account of the distribution of the land to the tribes after the conquest of the country. It says, verse 4,—“For the children of Joseph were TWO TRIBES, Manasseh and Ephraim: therefore, they gave no part unto the Levites in the land save cities to dwell in, with their suburbs for their cattle and for their substance.” I have more proofs than this, if Mr. Hine wishes.

34.—Would it be the tribe of Joseph or Manasseh that would have been divided?—The tribe of Joseph was divided, *i.e.*, Joseph’s two sons were taken as the heads of two tribes.

35.—Then the tribe of Joseph was divided into two parts; and was the tribe of Manasseh divided also into a second tribe?—It was not divided into two tribes, but into two halves, and they were called the half-tribes of Manasseh, simply because they received their inheritance in two separate sections of the country.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

36.—In the course of your opening remarks you quoted the command by Christ to His twelve disciples, “Go ye to the lost sheep of the House of Israel.” Do you understand the House of Israel in that command to mean Israel’s ten tribes?—Most certainly.

37.—Not Jews?—Decidedly not. I do not believe, nor ever had faith in a converted Jew.

38.—Then will you explain to me the fact stated in Acts 11:19, which I will read:—“Now they which were scattered abroad, upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, *preaching the Word to NONE BUT UNTO THE JEWS ONLY?*”—Yes, I quite believe that our Lord did exercise a certain prerogative in trying to persuade the Jewish people to believe in Himself, and I also believe that the Apostle Paul tried the conversion of the Jews, but in each case there was a signal failure.

39.—Do you mean to say the disciples did not obey the command Christ gave them?—No, I believe the tribe of Benjamin, that one special tribe allied to the House of Judah, obeyed the command.

40.—Why did they preach to the Jews *only*?—Oh, as far as the apostles were concerned, in certain instances, they might have preached to the Jews, but their great mission was with the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

41.—But here is the word “only”, which restricts their preaching to one particular class of people, to whom you say they were not sent?—Yes, I grant that, because in a certain time, in a certain day, they fulfilled a certain mission, and then they gave themselves to this one work which they have fulfilled.

42.—Do you mean they changed the nature of their work, and did one sort of work at one time and another sort at another time, without fresh instructions?—Quite so; because even the Apostle Paul, whose great mission was to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, tried to convert the Jews, and having failed he turned his back on them, and said, “Instead of talking to you, lo I turn to the Gentiles”.

43.—Why did these disciples who preached to the Jews only, not preach to the House of Israel?—I should be very sorry to say they did not.

44.—It says they preached to the Jews only.—At that time.

45.—How do you know?—How do you know to the contrary?

46.—By reading this statement, that they went everywhere preaching to none but the Jews?—At that time.

47.—Yes, when going forth to execute the Lord’s commission they preached to none but the Jews only. Why did they not preach to Israel according to your conception of Israel?—Perfectly right. Mr. Roberts is referring to a special time; that is, the time before redemption had come. It would have been folly on the part of the disciples to have gone forth on their grand mission of proclaiming redemption to the lost ten tribes until after the death of our Lord, because until that death had taken place no redemption could have been proclaimed.

48.—Are you not aware that the fact I have referred to—this preaching to none but the Jews only—was a fact that transpired after the death of Christ, and not before?—Then we come to the fact that after our Saviour had died, that is after He had redeemed Israel, even His own disciples had to proclaim the gospel, because they were to be a light unto the Gentiles, as well as proclaiming the gospel for the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

49.—To whom had these apostles to proclaim the gospel?—Their grand object, that is their chief mission, was with the lost sheep of the House of Israel; but their second mission was to the brethren of the House of Judah; and the third mission they took up was with the Gentiles, as Christ Himself came to Paul when at Damascus, they declaring they would not receive Paul’s testimony concerning Him. The Jews would not receive it. Hence you have the three distinct missions taken up by the apostles—the main one being to the lost sheep of the House of Israel; the second one being to the brethren of the House of Judah; and the third one being to the Gentiles whom they found in the highways, the byways, and so forth.

50.—My question is: Why did they in this case limit their operations to the Jews only?—Well, I suppose a man of method would apply a given time for given work.

51.—Can you tell me when the mission with the House of Israel, according to your conception, began?—Immediately after redemption.

52.—Then my question is: As this was “immediately after redemption,” according to your use of those words, why did they preach the word “to none but the Jews only”?—It did not at all follow immediately after redemption. The Apostle Paul was forbidden to pursue his fruitless mission on behalf of the Jews.

53.—It is not the mission of Paul I am discussing.—It matters not whether it is the mission of Paul or the mission of all the apostles.

54.—I return to the question: Why did these original disciples after redemption limit their work to the Jews only?—I do not know why they did it at that particular time, and Mr. Roberts does not know.

55.—Yes, I do; but it is not for me now to say. (Laughter and applause.) —Well, Mr. Roberts may know.

56.—You state that the British race, in these days, was to be found in the districts of Cappadocia and Bithynia and other places; the lost ten tribes, I think you say, were not lost then, but existed in these districts?—I am quite sure in the days of Christ the ten tribes were not lost, but known, and some of these were in the districts mentioned by Mr. Roberts.

57.—Bithynia is one of them?—Yes.

58.—Then I wish you to explain the statement in Acts 16:7,—“They assayed to go into Bithynia; but the Spirit *suffered them not*”—Well, I really do not know, and honestly you cannot show the connection of such a question with the identity question.

59.—There is this connection. You say the great work of the apostles was to preach to the lost ten tribes who, you say, were in Bithynia and other parts; and here they were expressly forbidden to go to Bithynia?—That does not follow. As far as their mission went, they would certainly know where they should go, because they would be inspired by Divine power.

60.—You say it is a mistake to speak of the apostles as Jews?—Yes, I quite believe, as far as the apostles were concerned, they were not Jews because no Jew, by the Word of God, can rightly become converted.

61.—You think it is a great mistake, that is your phrase — “A great mistake to speak of them as Jews”?—Yes, because they belonged, as Dr. Farrar declares in his *Life of Christ*, to that one tribe provided by God whom He separated for a certain work — that is the tribe of Benjamin, separated to be gospel-bearers. They belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, and God’s command was not disobeyed, because they have fulfilled their mission.

62.—I think you said that Peter was recognised not to be a Jew by his tongue?—Yes, I think that is a very clear identification, as far as Peter is concerned. His speech betraying him showed that he did not belong to the Jewish body.

63.—Then I wish to ask you how you explain this address, delivered by the Apostle Paul to Peter at Antioch, as related in Gal. 2:14: “I (Paul) said unto Peter before them all, If thou, BEING A JEW livest after the manner of Gentiles and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews. WE WHO ARE JEWS BY NATURE, etc”’?—There is no difficulty, as I see, in that, because Paul, who belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, and Peter, who was not of the Jewish sects but of the tribe of Benjamin; yet being connected with the tribe for a thousand years—connected with the House of Judah, by which you get the Jewish term “the Jews”, Paul and Peter had every right to declare that they were Jews.

64.—Did Paul make a mistake in saying Peter was a Jew, then?—No. Paul never made a mistake when he himself declared he was a Jew, and yet Paul declared he was an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin.

65.—Then, why do you say it is a great mistake for us to speak of the apostles as Jews?—We only say, as far as the apostles are concerned, that they had the right to term themselves Jews, because they were connected for so long a time with the Jewish House.

66.—Then it is not a mistake to speak of them as Jews?—As far as the tribe of Benjamin is concerned it would not be a mistake; but it would be more correct to declare they were Jews belonging to that house; but that would not apply to the tribe of Joseph, Gad, Reuben, or any other of the tribes.

[HERE TIME WAS CALLED. It being optional with Mr. Hine to question Mr. Roberts for fifteen minutes, or make a speech for that time, he chose to make a speech.]

MR. HINE ELECTS TO MAKE A SPEECH.

Mr. HINE:—Well, my dear friends, I declare—taking the Word of God to state that the Children of Israel should exist, a separated and severed people from all the other nations of the earth, made an everlasting covenant throughout their generation, confirmed by oath, which God Almighty could never break—we see the seed of Israel existing, severed from the other people. Then we see twelve tribes belonging to the same house. God Almighty comes forth and declares to these tribes; the whole of the twelve-tribe people of Israel, only existing as God’s chosen people, He declares certain promises, and conditional promises, quoted by Mr. Roberts, and mark you, very unfairly, and I beg of you to take Mr. Roberts’ statements in reference to the promise God Almighty has given to His people, as

simply recorded in Deuteronomy, with great suspicion. There is a very great deal in that; hence, if you take my words you will not find I am quoting from the promise given in Deuteronomy, but from a prophecy given at a far later date than that is recorded, and which was issued conditionally to the whole of the twelve tribes; hence we say this promise found recorded in Deuteronomy did not touch the great standard promise God Almighty gave to future times. You will find that the promise recorded in Genesis was a great promise given unconditionally; given to Abraham as an everlasting covenant throughout all generations. When the people came into the land as twelve tribes united, then God gave to them certain promises, and conditional; but the great promises that God gave to Abraham long before were unconditional. Thus we say, that after God broke the bands of Israel and Judah, He separated the family into two parts; and to the Apostle Paul, that grand man who acknowledged the division of Israel from Judah, the same command came forth to speak. If God Almighty could separate the family, and show favour to the one and the cold shoulder to the other, then God Almighty can be partial. When the Apostle Paul goes forth, with righteous indignation he says: "Who art thou that repliest against God? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump (the twelve tribes) to make one vessel unto honour, and the other unto dishonour." God need not have the two promises to divide it into two parts, so as to bring this about. Hence we see the division, and take Almighty God's Word, that He has divided the House of Israel into two parts, and until the return shall take place, which is yet in the future, God Almighty requires the division still in existence, so that the Children of Israel and the Children of Judah shall come together. Hence we see, taking the fact in Deuteronomy, the curses and blessings are pronounced for the whole of the twelve tribes.

After that event, God Almighty comes forth to divide the family into two parts, forming one vessel for honour, and the other to dishonour: the House of Israel for honour; and the Jews for dishonour as they now stand before us. Over the House of Judah the curse is pronounced in the same chapter Mr. Roberts has referred to — a chapter of curses. Judah, consisting of two tribes — the tribe of Joseph, and the tribe of Levi — this very night is under the curse; whereas the ten-tribe people, consisting of the House of Israel, are under the blessing pronounced in that chapter. Seeing the division of Israel from Judah existing this day, we can observe God's everlasting covenant that He has made, and that must stand, and surely stand, when God declares that the people — the people that He hath redeemed, the people He hath taken away from Moses; declaring that this people, the ten-tribe people — "This people that I formed for Myself, they shall show forth My praise". Paul, Peter, the apostles, go forth to the lost tribes; the people not actually lost, but yet known, because: Josephus declares that in his time the ten tribes were known — they were beyond the Euphrates in large numbers. Hence the mission was given to these exiled sheep, these lost sheep, in the sense of proclaiming redemption. How could Paul, supposing he was allied to the Jews, honestly declare: "You were once under the law, but now you are become dead to

the law"? Why, there is no discretion in the matter. God requires that the Jews this very night be under Moses, and being under him, they form one of God's witnessing people, the people of God's commands, waiting until their return shall take place, when they shall come forth and build their new temple. They are now recognising all the paraphernalia of the Mosaic economy: their sin-offerings, their burnt-offerings, and their peace-offerings.

Judah was told by God Almighty, in the last seven chapters of Ezekiel that if they did not comply with His instructions, they would be a wicked people, because they were told to go forth. But as far as the Apostles Paul and Peter were concerned, they were with the lost sheep, the people God Almighty declared He had redeemed—that is, taken away from Moses—the people God declared should be the people who should show forth His praise, becoming a people in Christ; hence this people were to be a redeemed people, a Christian people. The Apostle Paul glories that he is an Israelite, of the tribe of Benjamin, of the seed of Abraham, of the very seed which God Almighty declared should still exist, separated and severed from all the other nations of the earth. And so we find the Apostle Paul going to this people and saying: "You were once under the law, under Moses; but now you are delivered from the law, and become a Christian people. Once under the law, you have now become dead to the law; it was only to bring you to Christ". If I could twist these words as applied to any of the Gentile people, I should say your great Apostle declared that the Gentile people were under Moses; but have you ever had a Gentile nation under Moses? The only people who were under the law; the only people upon earth who have had the Mosaic Law to bring them to Christ, were the people Israel, whom Christ came to redeem. "I am not sent", says my Lord, "but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel." Why was it He did not go forth to the Jews though He tried to persuade some of them to believe, but afterwards they fell away? The Apostle declares, as far as Judah was concerned, that they should simply be a stumbling-block. The prophets declare, that seeing he should not perceive, and hearing he should not understand; and that they would stumble at our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Christ came forth and declared: "Your house shall be left desolate, as without Me, until the time when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" — the second coming of our Lord, when that House shall receive our Saviour. Hence, they believe in the prophecy; and honestly, as honest men still remain under Moses, still being in God's hand a witness for Him. So we come to the matter that Paul came forth, and Christ declares: "I must send thee unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel". The people once under the law, he delivered from it — the people once under it became dead to it, the people once under the law, which was only a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ.

Hence, upon the testimony of your Saviour, His mission was for the people — the ten-tribe people — who must have been once under the law; and no Gentile

nation has ever been under it, or become dead to it. So we come to this separated nation, this seed which Almighty God covenanted to keep separate; we come to this people that Christ came to redeem; and you never could find that people after the division had taken place; and since redemption did come, you never could find the people apart from Christ. They must be the people in whom "I will be glorified" — "This people have I formed for Myself". They shall take up the missionary work. Their light shall be in Christ, and as Christians they shall go forth throughout all the nations of the earth, and shall become a light unto the Gentiles; the very seed, being God's own seed, to be the means of blessing to all the other nations of the earth. Hence we see — as far as the accounts of the apostles are concerned, which our brother Roberts has referred to — we have shown as far as Peter and Paul were concerned, that they belonged to Benjamin, because they belonged to that House, which for two thousand years or more was allied to the House of Judah, and had every privilege and right to call themselves of the stock of Judah — Jews of the House of Judah; but also they were Israelites. And then, the tribe of Benjamin separated from the ten tribes? Why? Why are you going to leave Jeroboam with nine tribes? Why take one away? Why, that Christ might have light-bearers in the city who should bless His name. It was natural one tribe should be taken away from Jeroboam — the tribe of Benjamin, and separated from the ten tribes, and should be allied to the two tribes which should become three tribes, in order that when the time should come — the time of redemption — when our Lord should appear to take Israel away from Moses, He might have a set tribe whose special duty should be to proclaim the gospel, light-bearers, heralds to His own people and the Gentile peoples round about. Hence, thank God, and we devoutly thank Him for that arrangement; this tribe taken away, and allied to these two tribes, and at the time of Christ the Scripture was complied with: "Gather yourselves together ye Children of Benjamin, to flee out from the midst of Jerusalem".

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

67.—Do I understand you to say, Mr. Hine, that Jeroboam did not receive ten tribes of Israel?—I am quite sure Jeroboam did receive ten tribes, because he received the tribe of Manasseh, which was destined to become afterwards separated.

68.—If Jeroboam received ten tribes, how come you to call Benjamin one of the ten?—I am quite sure, as far as the tribe of Manasseh was concerned, it never has been one of the ten-tribe people, but was destined to be a separate thirteenth tribe established from the twelve.

69.—If Manasseh was not one of the ten tribes, why do you say that Jeroboam received ten tribes?—Simply because Jeroboam had the tribe of Manasseh before it became separated from the other tribes.

70.—Before it became separated from what tribe?—Before it became separated from all the tribes.

71.—Was Manasseh one of the ten tribes that God promised to give to Jeroboam?—Manasseh was never a tribe promised to belong to the House of Israel.

72.—Then, did Jeroboam receive the ten tribes or not?—He received the nine tribes belonging to the House of Israel, and Manasseh, which was not required then to be separated.

73.—From whom?—From the other nine tribes.

74.—Where do you read of Manasseh being separated from the other nine?—Both as a matter of prophecy and history. God required Manasseh (in Genesis) to become a people separated from Ephraim.

75.—Is that an inference or a fact—which?—It becomes a part of the fact. Hence God required that there should be two distinct peoples from the same sect: that Manasseh should be a great people, but that Ephraim should become a greater people. God Almighty did prophesy, and it became a fact in history. God required Manasseh to be a separate people from the ten-tribe people of Israel.

76.—Give me a passage which shows that Manasseh was to be separated from the ten tribes?—I think you have it at the time when God Almighty declared, through His servant, that Manasseh should be a people, and Ephraim should become a greater people than he.

77.—My question is: Is there a passage in the Bible which says that Manasseh was to be separated from the ten tribes?—Most certainly.

78.—Where?—In this very chapter of Genesis.

79.—Give me the verse?—Will some one be good enough to give it?
A Voice: the 48th.

80.—What verse do you rely on?—I rely on the Word of God, who declared that Ephraim should be greater than Manasseh.

81.—Tell me the chapter?—The 48th chapter.

82.—But the verse?—The 19th.

83.—This you produce in proof of the proposition that Manasseh was to be separated from the ten tribes?—A voice: The 20th.

84.—I will read the 19th and 20th verses, which are referred to as proof of the alleged fact: “And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: he also (Manasseh) shall become a people, and he shall also be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations”. What has that to do with the ten tribes given to Jeroboam?—You have

two distinct nations going forth. Ephraim is the embodiment of the ten-tribe people; hence, when God says: "Woe unto the drunkards of Ephraim", he is not alluding to the two-tribe people of Judah but to the ten-tribe people of Israel.

85.—If Manasseh was a tribe, afterwards to become a great people, did not Jeroboam receive ten tribes and not nine?—We have granted that Ephraim —

86.—Say yes or no. I showed you an example of brevity in answering you. I ask yes or no, did Jeroboam receive the ten tribes?—Yes.

87.—Then why do you say he only received nine, and that Benjamin, which formed part of the Kingdom of Judah, was one tribe separated from the ten, leaving only nine?—Anyone could see that Benjamin was a tribe separated from the others.

88.—Was Josephus right or wrong in saying that ten tribes existed in his day?—He was wrong, and I have no faith in Josephus except so far as he answers my purpose. (Sensation.)

89.—Do you think that Josephus, a public man of the Jewish nation, was not a better judge than you of the historical facts of his own race?—He made many blunders.

90.—Why then do you quote his testimony that the ten tribes existed in his day?—It is a grand fact.

91.—If so, was he right or wrong in recognising ten tribes as given to Jeroboam?—Wrong, because Dan and Simeon were not there; and he tells you there were only two tribes subject to the Romans. He was wrong there were three.

92.—Levi was not a tribe, having inheritance with the others?—Levi has always been a tribe.

93.—Well, I will leave that. You say the British race, in the days of the apostles, were contending earnestly for circumcision?—I never said so; I should be very sorry to say such a thing.

94.—You say so in your published works (*Forty-seven Identifications*, 131st thousand, page 8). (Mr. Hine laughs.)

95.—Then you withdraw that remark?—I never made the remark. I could not be such a fool. (Laughter.)

96.—Do you not say that the ancestors of the British nation were in the northern districts of Asia Minor and Southern Thrace in the days of the apostles?—Some of them.

97.—Were then they contending for circumcision?—I do not think Paul was.

98.—I did not say Paul. I said those to whom Paul went to preach?—I do not think the people Paul wrote to and went to preach to: I do not think Paul at all contended for circumcision, and he is the chief of the apostles, and his word ought to be taken first.

99.—I am not speaking of Paul: I am speaking of the Jewish or Israelitish people to whom Paul went to preach?—Our friend says he does not refer to Paul, and yet he is referring to him. Paul did find them contending for circumcision, because they were under the Mosaic law; and that commanded the rite of circumcision.

100.—And those, you say, were the ancestors of the British people?—And those were the ancestors, to my own knowledge, of the British people.

101.—Why have the British people abandoned circumcision?—Because Christ came to redeem Israel, and circumcision is a rite belonging to Moses, so that that was taken away, and you never could find the ten tribes with it again. It would be opposed to Scriptural knowledge to suppose that you could find the ten-tribe people with the rite of circumcision.

102.—What right have the British people to consider themselves as a nation of God, even of the descendants of Abraham, if they do not practise circumcision?—Oh, if Christ came to redeem the ten-tribe people of Israel — that is to take them away from Moses—you never could reasonably suppose they would have the rite of circumcision. We have answered the question twice or three times.

103.—You will have to answer it again, for I have to read something which bears directly on the matter?—Read it please.

104.—I will. In Genesis 17:10, these words were addressed to Abraham, the alleged progenitor of the British race, on account of our connection with whom you claim for them that they occupy a privileged position: “This is My covenant, which ye shall keep between Me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations * * * and *My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant*. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin *is not circumcised*, THAT SOUL SHALL BE CUT OFF FROM HIS PEOPLE; *he hath broken My covenant*.” I ask, as a fact, do not the Jews circumcise to-day?—And why?

105.—Answer the question first?—Because the Jews to this day are under Moses, and not under redemption.

106.—Circumcision is not under Moses; what I have read is under Abraham?—Circumcision was always commanded under the law of Moses. (Cries of “Question”.)

107.—My question is: Do not the Jews circumcise?—And that they will do until He comes.

108.—And do not the English abstain from it?—They never were required to observe it after the time of their redemption.

109.—Is redemption a national or an individual thing?—Redemption is decidedly national, and has no connection whatever with salvation.

110.—If so, what is the meaning of the song of the redeemed,—“Thou hast redeemed us to God * * * out of *every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation*”? (Rev. 5:9).—That refers to the future. We had far better wait until that time shall arise.

111.—Are there two redemptions then?—There is only one redemption to Israel—that is the being taken away or redeemed from the Mosaic law.

112.—Are there two redemptions in Christ?—Only one redemption to Israel.

113.—You change the terms of my question. Are there one or two redemptions in relation to Christ?—There are two redemptions, because the ten-tribe people — the House of Israel — are already redeemed from Moses; and the time has yet to come when the two-tribe people — the House of Judah — shall become redeemed; and that time only shall come, and never can come; until they see Him come whom they have pierced. When that time shall come, then they shall be redeemed. Hence, as far as the term redemption is concerned, there must be two. One has already taken place, as far as Israel is concerned; the other has yet to take place, as far as the House of Judah is concerned.

MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH.

Mr. HINE:—My dear friends,—I do not want you to be disturbed in your minds. I would call upon God that, as far as the matter of this discussion is concerned, we may be calm, and catch from God Almighty the holy feeling, because we are only, after all, dealing with those things that must be for the good, the weal, and the welfare of your nation. Hence, when we say you are identical with Israel, we shall try to bring forth our proofs to-morrow night; for we have very wisely, as I think, studied not to bring forth any one of our identities, leaving these for the future, but have only wanted to impress on your minds that God Almighty required His own people separate throughout all time, until the time shall come when the earth shall be taken away, and when eternity shall break upon us. We say naturally then, seeing God requires that we shall be a separate people, that we can identify ourselves with the nation God required to be lost, to be redeemed, to give the light to the Gentiles; and He Himself declares that He comes forth to be not only the light to the Gentiles, but to be the glory of this people — the glory of your people. Hence you have these two promises of our Lord and Saviour, saying He Himself recognised the literal distinction of the ten-tribe people as existing this very day, because He comes forth to be not only the light unto the Gentiles, but He Himself becomes the glory of His people Israel. And by virtue of the fact that you are the only nation under heaven of whom Christ becomes the glory, for you cannot stretch your hands across the people who are worshipping stocks and stones, but you come to your own people that God Almighty came to redeem; you can see His own mark, that you are this very people — still kept separate, and still meant by Him to be used in the great mission work of the world.

In a very few years from now, when missionary glory and light shall shine forth, shall many people, by virtue of your being identical with Israel — and never until then, be joined to the Lord. Hence we want you to go away this evening under the impression that God must keep His word, when He requires His people Israel to be a separate people; and by virtue of your being identical with that people, after your return you shall have missionary glory, and give God the glory of your returning; you shall shine with a sublime glory, and know there are many nations joined to the Lord. Why, the fact of your being identical with the people of Israel gives you the motive power by which you shall grow. I am glad, indeed, dear friends to know that we have spent so pleasant an evening, without any very severe bruises; and we hope it shall be as kindly a meeting that we shall hold to-morrow night. I do not know whether there is any vote of thanks, but as far as I am concerned, I am thankful to his Lordship for the very kind way in which he has been pulling my coat-tails and controlling my actions. (Applause.)

MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH.

Mr. ROBERTS:—I exceedingly regret, dear friends, that the time at our disposal for the discussion of this subject is so limited as to compel the omission of material matters that ought to be canvassed and considered in the discussion of this question.

Mr. HINE:—Why did you not say twelve o'clock?

Mr. ROBERTS: I said twelve nights, and that was better; but Mr. Hine declined twelve nights, and we are obliged to be content with three. I am sorry, because I feel greatly embarrassed by the abundance of matter which it is impossible to bring into such circumscribed limits. However, I must be content to make the best of the circumstances. The circumstances of the case require me to submit argument to you, and not to indulge in assertion. I was engaged in argument at the time when, perhaps to the audience, the more interesting part of the proceedings commenced. I was then saying that the ten tribes who were constituted a separate kingdom under Jeroboam, were 300 years afterwards driven out of the land to circumstances of evil, to circumstances of dispersion, weakness, and obscurity; to circumstances incompatible with the conception that in our day, in our country, they are to be found in the powerful nation of Britain. I will now ask your attention to one or two brief statements, showing the circumstances into which they were to depart when deported from the land, and direct attention particularly to the prophet Hosea, because, beyond all cavil, he particularly deals with the ten tribes.

I call your attention to such a passage as this: Hosea 1:4:—"I will cause to cease the kingdom of the House of Israel;" then the sixth verse: "I will *no more have mercy upon the House of Israel*". The ninth verse says: "*Ye are not My people*", and chap. 2:11, says: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths"; cause to cease "her sabbaths"! concerning which

Mr. Hine says the ten tribes of Israel must be found with the sabbath. Further, God says by Hosea: "The Children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice", etc. (3:4). Further, "Because thou (Israel) hast rejected knowledge, I also will reject thee" (4:6). "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone" (4:17). "Israel and Ephraim shall fall in their iniquity" (5:5). "They shall go with their flocks and herds to seek the Lord, *but they shall not find Him*, FOR HE HATH WITHDRAWN HIMSELF FROM THEM" (5:6). "Ephraim shall be *desolate* in the day of rebuke" (5:9). "I will be unto Ephraim *as a moth*" (5:12). "I will be unto Ephraim *as a lion* * * * I will tear and go away, and none shall rescue" (5:14). "When they shall go, I will spread My net upon them *I will bring them down to the fowls of the heaven*: I will chastise them as their congregation hath heard" (7:12). "*Israel is swallowed up*: now shall they be *among the Gentiles as a vessel wherein is no pleasure*" (8:8). "As for Ephraim, *their glory shall fly away like a bird from the birth*, and from the womb, and from the conception" (9:11). "Ephraim, as I saw Tyrus, is planted in a pleasant place: but *Ephraim shall bring forth his children to the murderer*" (9:13). "MY GOD WILL CAST THEM AWAY, because they did not hearken unto Him: and they SHALL BE WANDERERS AMONG THE NATIONS" (9:17). "I will meet them *as a bear that is bereaved of her whelps*, and will rend the caul of their heart, and there will I devour them like a lion: the wild beast shall tear them" (13:8). "*Though he be fruitful among his brethren*, an east wind shall come, the wind of the Lord shall come up from the wilderness, AND HIS SPRING SHALL BECOME DRY, AND HIS FOUNTAIN SHALL BE DRIED UP: he shall spoil the treasure of all pleasant vessels" (13:15).

These passages of prophecy are sufficient of themselves to show that the ten tribes were to depart to dispersion, vagrancy and curse, and to continue in that state until the latter days. There is another point of much importance to consider. There is a land which constitutes the basis of God's whole proceedings towards His people Israel, and apart from which, they are never considered except in banishment. It is not the land of England, it is not what Mr. Hine speaks of as "the isles" on which we may have something to say to-morrow evening. It is another country altogether than Britain, a land with which you are all acquainted, a land which has been made memorable, if by nothing else, by the appearance and sufferings of Jesus Christ, whose appearance upon the earth already as the great light of the House of David, has produced a great effect, but which will produce a still greater effect when the prophecy of Amos is fulfilled; that "in that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen:" when he, the son of David, shall set it up in truth and righteousness, and execute judgment and righteousness in the land as the prophets declare. What land is this? The land appears at the very beginning of Divine dealings with the earth, it is visible all down the course of those dealings, and it shines in glory at the end, "when the land that was desolate shall become like the Garden of Eden" (Ezek. 36:35). Abraham was called into it as a stranger, and it was said to him: "The land wherein thou art a stranger, to thee will I give it". Speaking to Moses, the Lord says: "The land shall not be sold for ever, for the *land is Mine*; for ye are strangers and sojourners with Me". I am informed that my time has expired, and I must submit to the rules of the debate, and reserve further remarks till to-morrow night.

SECOND NIGHT

MR. HINE: My Lord, and ye Children of Israel,—As far as this night's work is concerned, I have got an idea that I am going to put my foot in it. We will recall what we passed over last night. We showed you by the Word of God that by His covenant, the people of Israel were to be kept distinct and separated from all the other nations of the earth. If the people of Israel comprised twelve tribes then, if God Almighty kept His promise, these twelve tribes now exist upon the earth, separated from all others. We showed you that in after time God divided those twelve tribes into two parts, forming one for honour and the other for dishonour. We gave to you the suggestion founded upon the Word of God, that if the second-time return had taken place — if the second-time return has already been accomplished, then it would be vain, completely vain on our part to look after the tribes of Israel; because if they be returned, then they would not be lost. We showed you by the Word of God that if the tribes had returned, and God had not fulfilled His promises by a score or so, that then by the score or so God Almighty would have broken the promises that He had made; that if the return had taken place, there was to be no more pulling up from the land; and if the return had taken place there was to be no more sighing and sorrowing; and if the return had taken place, there was to be another *dividing* of the waters; and we told you, as we have positive knowledge from the Scriptures, that there are a score or more such promises made by God Almighty of circumstances and events that should take place when that return has been effected. Hence to say the return has already been accomplished, these circumstances having come to pass, then we should reflect upon the sure Word of our God, which declares that it is impossible that the return should take place without being surrounded by these events; and we say not only reflect upon the Word of God Almighty, but upon His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, who declared that every jot and tittle of the prophecies should be fulfilled. Hence we come to the conclusion given to us by God Almighty, and of which we are quite positive, that the return has not yet taken place. Hence it is yet to take place. Hence the people of Israel, the ten-tribed people, the ten-tribe section of the same house are yet a lost people, and to-night we come to give some suggestions from the word of God how we may find that people — find the ten-tribed people that God decreed should be told off for honour,—the people that we reminded you last night were to be redeemed from Moses.

You will remember that we divided the tribes into two parts, the House of Israel ten tribes, and the House of Judah two tribes; that God wills, as far as the people of Judah are concerned, that they shall yet remain under Moses; when the return shall take place, then, it will be a second struggle to re-establish the Mosaic rites, and to serve God Almighty under Moses, because they are not redeemed. Hence any doubt being conveyed to your mind that God Almighty would never save a

soul apart from a belief in Christ, is not founded upon the Word of God. It is directly contrary to the Word of God, because he declares in Ezekiel 34, the last verse, that He will accept the people of Judah under Moses, under sacrifice, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, peace-offerings, and the rest. Hence we say God has declared that He will accept that people under Moses; but our Lord comes saying, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel"; hence these ten-tribed people must be redeemed from Moses, taken away from the Mosaic rites, and they must now exist upon the earth a people in Christ,—a Christian nation apart from the rites of Moses,—apart from the rite of circumcision, and certainly apart from the institution of genealogy, because these redeemed people were to be the people to show forth God's praises,—a people in whom God Almighty would be glorified,—that they should go forth to all nations of the earth, a blessing—the means of blessing to all other people. And we think we showed you, or wanted to show you, that, as far as Judah is concerned, she is not a proselytising people. If you wanted to enter under the Mosaic law, the Jews would not receive you. If you expressed your belief that you would like to become a Jew, they would look upon you with suspicion and turn the cold shoulder to you; and rightly, because God only wants that sort, the two-tribed sort, to be separated for Him under Moses. Hence the ten-tribed people must be the only people on the earth up to the present time that could rightly be called a Christian nation, and that is one of our identities. We never could find the ten-tribed people unless we find them under Christ, redeemed from Moses, with the veil torn away from their gaze when they shall believe in Christ—to be the special people to show forth His praises, to take up the missionary work and go forth in missionary labour to all the nations of the earth.

We are glad to find all the tribes in our own Christian nation. We may say, in passing, that we do not identify the people of Israel with the English. We know that you have a little thing formed in London lately called the Anglo-Israel Association, which means the identifying the Anglo-Saxons, simply the English branch, with the lost tribes. The very title of that Association is a delusion; because to identify Israel, the people of Israel, you must take in the whole stock. You must take in the Welsh people, and the Scottish people, and part of the Irish people. Hence in founding any institution, instead of using the delusive term of Anglo-Israel, it must be the British-Israel Association, because that takes in the whole British-speaking people, the whole British race, and that will include the whole of these ten tribes without any one of them being missing. Hence God Almighty required of the ten-tribed people that so long as the sun and moon shall endure, the ordinances of day and night being in continuance—that so long shall this ten-tribed people be a nation before Him. God Almighty required of the two-tribed people that they should simply be nothing more than a dispersed people without inheritance throughout all nations of the earth. Then we may give forth, and rightly give forth, this idea, that as the two-tribed people of the House of Judah are literally — this very night they do literally — replying to the prophecies,

any minister of religion, any minister coming forth to stand in his pulpit, and giving it forth before his people that the people of Judah only existed as a spiritual people, would receive the lie cast in his teeth, and the Jew himself would stand forth as a people, as a representative of the people literally and not spiritually, replying to His prophecy.

Hence we say, as to the House of Judah comprising only two tribes literally and not spiritually — aye, and spiritual Israel — it is a delusion, we dare not say of the devil, but comes from darkness — and as soon as affirmed the very intelligence of our own nation, the majority of the people who are not now found connected with your Christian Associations, because we have put before them that horrid delusion that Israel could never exist except as a spiritual seed — the intelligence of the people gives the cold shoulder to your ministers, including the clergy of the Church of England and all the different sections of the Dissenters — the 365 in number know why. These people have suffered — just by putting forth that spiritual notion, — they have suffered the birth-right of your people to slip through their fingers. That is the result after 2,000 years' preaching, — and we will guarantee that if we had another 2,000 years before us, and we still clung to this deception, this delusion of a spiritual Israel, the intelligence of this country would yet again slip through their fingers, and instead of having those 365 miserable and horrible divisions in the so-called Christian church, we should have, in the course of ages, thousands upon thousands. And as we say the people of Judah literally and not spiritually comply with that prophecy, it follows by logic — that comes to the heart of every man possessed of intelligence — that so it must be with the ten tribes, part of the same family, the family destined ultimately to re-unite, because God tells you why it is that the two sticks are to come together, and if that house literally complies with the prophecy, then the ten-tribed people should also literally and not spiritually comply with their prophecies.

Then we say, if you insist in your folly, and we always declare it to be a folly, and we have the authority of God's Word for so declaring it, and we shall ever declare before the British people that to insist upon Israel being a spiritual seed — if you insist upon that, then we are armed with a right by God Almighty, who has given to all His children the gift of reason — no man is entitled to become a lunatic, no man is entitled to become an imbecile man — God has given that gift of reason, unless there is something wrong within his cranium — so that we say, if you insist upon Israel, the ten-tribed people, being a simply spiritual seed, we have a right to insist that you shall also mean the spiritual seed of Judah. And there is no man here — if there is, I would be very glad to meet him — and you have no minister in London, if we might be personal, naming such persons as Dr. Stoughton and Dr. Vaughan, naming those you esteem eminent in the ministry, you have no men in your midst in this City of London, this great metropolis of the world, who would dare to meet me and insist, on a public platform, that the seed of Judah, the House of Judah, comprising the tribe of Levi, exist only in these

days as a spiritual seed. No man has the pluck to come forth before me on a London platform to insist upon such an absurdity, because he knows full well that he would be floored before the intelligence of the people of this country. Hence if it becomes impossible to spiritualise away the seed of Judah, so it seems impossible to spiritualise away the people of Israel. Hence when the time of return, yet further God Almighty declares that the children of Israel and Judah, the two people shall come together, and as we say, before the public, for men to talk, for Bible students to talk about the rubbish, the nonsense, of the return of the Jews — why that is a lop-sided idea of Scripture. It is utterly impossible for Judah, by the Word of God, to return alone, because God declares by His own teaching, and by His own decree, that the Children of Israel and the Children of Judah shall come together — not one without the other, but both together.

Hence, in looking after Israel, we say, in fixing upon the British people, not the English people only, — but in fixing upon the British people as being identical with the ten-tribed people of Israel, just as Judah complies, and literally complies, with their prophecy, so should this ten-tribed people comply to all of their prophecies. You never could find the people of Israel unless you find them fulfilling literally, entirely complying with and corresponding to the prophecies that God Almighty gave to that people. Hence Mr. Roberts gave us a splendid Identity Lecture. He came to us referring to the prophecies recorded in the Book of Hosea; he came to us referring to a prophet who lived at a time — please mark this — Hosea, a prophet who lived at a time when neither Israel nor Judah had ever been subject to captivity, when both people were in their lands, when both people in separate kingdoms existed as nations before God Almighty, and before the people of Israel sinned against God Almighty, and He was angry with them. Hence, launching out before them prophecy touching their future, He declared that He would not utterly take them away — that they should be entirely removed from their land — and we know that that was the fact because after they had been entirely removed from their land, then the people who were imported into the region of Samaria in the land of Israel, found lions multiplied, and they wanted to know why these devouring beasts should come and make ravages upon them; and they said, “It is because we are not following the customs, the religion of the God of this land”; and they sent to the king of Samaria and they besought of him that he would send back some few of the men who should teach the people imported into that land the customs of the religion of the people of Israel.

And you have it recorded in your Scriptures that only, only one man was returned, showing that the prophecy of Hosea which God declared through him that He would utterly and entirely take the people away was literally fulfilled. Then God Almighty alluding to the time of their captivity, comes forth to declare, “Now you shall be for many days without a king — this people, — you shall be taken into captivity, and during the time of that captivity the yoke of a Gentile power shall be around your neck; you shall be without a king, and you shall abide many days without a king”. A good minister in this City of London — Dr.

McAuslane, has taught a certain disciple of his church that we never could be identical with the people of Israel, unless we were existing without a king. We say, what teaching from God Almighty! It does not come from Hosea, because it is against Scripture entirely. That Scripture declares simply that after Israel were exiled, when brought into their captivity then for a time, during the time that the yoke was upon their neck, for a time they should be many days without a king; and that perhaps was literally fulfilled when the people were in exile, in captivity, under the yoke of the Assyrians.

Then we say you shall be in no manner of doubt as to the whereabouts of the people of Israel; because, as Mr. Roberts quoted from the Scriptures last night, after the time that they had been for many days without a king, they were to become wanderers. There was to be a time of wandering, a time when they should leave their land, and a time that should be an interval before the time that they should settle in their distant possessions, and God declares that their ultimate possession upon the face of the earth should be isles. Mr. Roberts referred last night, and perhaps chided me with having brought forth that idea — yet we stoutly declare and maintain that God does require, did require, of His own people, the ten-tribed people that in the time of their exile outside their country, they should occupy isles, and the very position of these isles is mentioned: they were to be isles afar off. Hence when the time of gathering shall come, when the time of their identity shall come, the proclamation goes forth to the isles afar off, saying “He that scattered Israel shall gather him,” and we have a Scripture where God commands the people of Israel during their exiled state, and when living in the isles, that they were to glorify the Lord God of Israel in the isles of the west — “isles afar off,” and “isles in the west.” Are we quite sure that that is the right rendering of that Scripture — showing, as you have it in your translation, the word “sea” — but that very word sea is interpreted in the Bible thirty times elsewhere “west.” Hence interpreting it to mean that they shall glorify God in the west, they shall arrive in these isles—like the Zulus, a barbarous people, a people of idolatry. In the times before they entered these islands, they were to lose their paths, have their way hedged in, be forgetful of their ancestry, and not to remember their name.

They were to be called by another name, not the name of Israel; they were to be called by another name, and falling into idolatry, they must have arrived in these islands according to the Word of God and the teaching of Scripture, in a barbarous condition, because it was not until the moment they arrived in these islands in this idolatrous state that God states He would once more speak comfortably to them. Hence we say of your people, it is a grand thing to know that the ancient ancestors of these islands were an idolatrous people; because God required the people of Israel to arrive in these islands in an idolatrous state, and you have complied with that. Then God Almighty required the people to renew their strength. They had settled in these islands, they had broken the yoke of the Assyrians from off their necks; then arriving in these islands they were to renew their strength and increase as a people, because they were the multitudinous seed;

Hosea declaring by the very same pen, they were called by another name, alluding to the time when they were in the islands. "Yet the number of the Children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered." As far as Judah is concerned, you have it, not recorded in Deuteronomy, but recorded in Jeremiah, that God would bereave them of children, which is the only corresponding prophecy that they should be few in number.

As far as the people of Israel were concerned, they were to renew their strength—increase in number, and increase in their strength. "Listen, O isles, unto them"—God Almighty speaking of them in prophecy, when they were in the islands they were to cry out, "The place is too strait, too narrow." Why? Why should those islands be too strait, too narrow? By reason of the inhabitants, the multitudinous seed of the people increasing as the sand of the sea for multitude; and they cry before God Almighty, "Give place to me that I may dwell." Then you have the Word of God coming forth to declare in response to that prayer—God Almighty addressing them, not as a spiritual seed, but as a literal seed only, "I will give thee to establish the earth, and cause thee to inherit the desolate heritages." So that these people arriving in these islands, finding these islands too small, too strait for them increasing as a people, God Almighty opened up spaces to them to inherit—the desolate heritages. And by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, God Almighty has given to you your colonies, by which God has fulfilled that grand promise to Abraham whereby He declared you should become a nation and a company of nations. Hence by the having of your colonies, you have complied with that prophecy.

MR. ROBERTS:—My Lord, Mr. Hine, Ladies and Gentlemen,—If I do not follow Mr. Hine so exactly as he would like, and perhaps as you would like, it is because he does not supply me with matters with which I can deal in a critical way. He indulges in a perpetual stream of assertion. He says God Almighty says this of His people, and that of His people; but he does not prove that He does so. If he attempted to prove that what he says is true, then it would be in my power, or at all events would give me the opportunity to show that it is not true. In some cases it is easily in my power to do so. Such, for instance, as where he alleged that the contrast between Israel and Judah is to be found in this: that while God declares that Judah should be a dispersed people, He says, concerning Israel, that Israel would be a nation for ever. I turn to the passage of Scripture in which there is a statement to that effect, and you yourselves will be witnesses by my simple reading of it, that the declaration that they should be a nation for ever, applies not to the ten-tribed section only, but to the House of Judah as well—that is, to the two nations that God had chosen—to which the words referred to apply.

In Jeremiah 33:24: "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying. The TWO FAMILIES which the Lord hath chosen, He hath even cast them off? thus they have despised My people, that they should be NO MORE A NATION before them." Then He proceeds to say: "If My covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast

away the seed of Jacob, and David My servant," and so forth. So that the decree of perpetual nationality applies to the two families and not to one only. If Mr. Hine would put it in my power similarly to test his other assertions, I should be able, I know, to show in detail that the same misrepresentation characterises all his allegations. I may call attention to one little point as illustrative of the very uncertain nature of his position. He impugned the title of a certain association formed in London on the ground it was not sufficient to identify the Anglo-Saxon stock with Israel; that we must take into account the Welsh, and the other elements that have gone to form the British population. Now, Mr. Hine, it strikes me, must have changed his mind on that point, for in his *Twenty-seven Identifications*, 26th thousand, on page 16, I find him saying—illustrative of the pushing characteristic of so-called British Israel, "In our country we have the Welsh, *descended from the ancient Britons*, pushed into a corner of the country *once their own*, and subject to OUR RULE:" while in *Forty-seven Identifications*, 131st thousand, page 27, he says: "The Welsh people * * * *cannot be the descendants of the ancient Britons* by the fact that they are not dying out," He says in another place, the ancient Britons were not Israel. If they were not Israel, and the Welsh are descended from them, by what process of argument does he identify the Welsh as a portion of the Israelitish nationality?

The fact is, there is a great deal that is inconsistent, and much that is altogether fictitious and unfounded in the theory, and in the facts and arguments by which it is attempted to be established. The distinction between Judah and Israel is one of these fictions. There is a distinction, but it cannot be drawn so sharply as Mr. Hine's theory does. It is unnatural and unscriptural to do so. The distinction was political and natural, and has none of the recondite significance claimed for it by Mr. Hine. Its origin was as simple and natural as anything could be in this world. Let me recall your attention briefly to the circumstances. They are so elementary in their nature that even school-children must be supposed to be acquainted with them. In the first place, let us consider the term "Israel," which plays so large a part in this controversy. How comes it to be applied as a national designation at all? Simply because that it was the name of Jacob, divinely bestowed upon him at an advanced point in his life. We read of that in Genesis 32:28, also in Genesis 35:10. There you find the intimation that his name was no more to be called Jacob, "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel." The reason for the change is given, but we need not trouble ourselves with it now. The twelve tribes—the multiplication of Jacob's twelve sons, were literally Jacobites, but by reason of the change of Jacob's name to Israel they were Israelites, and they are continually described as Israelites in the account of their deliverance from the bondage in Egypt. The whole nation was Israelite, as consisting of the descendants of the twelve sons of Israel. There was no change when formed into a monarchy in the Holy Land; they were Israel, all the twelve tribes, the whole of them, every one of them, without the least exception or distinction.

How came they afterwards, or any part of them, to be called Jews? The answer to this requires a moment's attention to a political episode that arose in the history

of the nation, resulting in the separation of ten of the tribes from subjection to the House of David. This separation was not for blessing but for curse every way; for it was as a punishment that it happened, as a punishment for the sins of Solomon, and it was not for the blessedness of the ten tribes that they were separated. Their position was in no way altered by the separation; they were still subject to the law of Moses, and their future lot depended entirely upon their submission to that law, or otherwise; as I illustrated in the argument last night, and as shown by the destiny that finally befell them. As to the name Israel, by which they came to be known, there is no difficulty. They were Israel before, and as constituting the bulk of the nation they were Israel still, and retained the original name of the nation. It did not follow that the two tribes left behind were not Israel. They were not de-Israelitised by the separation, yet they had to be described by another name, for it would have been inconvenient, as a matter of ordinary communication, to have described the one as Israel, and the other as Israel also. When we have to distinguish between two things we have to employ distinctive terms, even if the two things are sections of the same thing. How then was the smaller section of the house of Israel to be distinguished? Obviously by the name of the tribe that took the leading part in it. That tribe was the royal tribe—it furnished the dynasty of the whole house, and that was the tribe of Judah; and therefore it was described as the Kingdom of Judah, not to signify that it was not Israel but to signify that it was a distinct political section of the original and complete race of Israel.

Now follow the history, and you will find the origin of the term Jew, and the reason why that term came ultimately to be applied to the whole twelve tribes. The ten-tribed section of the House of Israel soon disappeared from the scene. After a career of three hundred years it ceased to have political existence. The kingdom was overthrown, and the ten tribes became a rabble of wanderers,—exiled, dispersed and despised. But the Kingdom of Judah was left upon the scene to represent the original race of Israel. This Kingdom of Judah was a monument, a political monument of Israel, visible to the eyes of the world. The race of Israel, visible to the eyes of the world. The race of Israel was politically visible in no other form. The people composing the Kingdom of Judah came to be called Ju's from Judah, finally spelt Jews from this; by a very natural process, the whole race of Israel came to be known by the same term. The Jews, or people of Judah, were the only visible portion of Israel; in a political sense visible, that is, to the nations of the Gentiles. Not knowing anything of the ten tribes except that they were part and parcel of this race forming the Jewish kingdom, they called them all Jews, and the term "Jews" came, in course of time, to be applied to the whole race of Israel. The process was slow but natural. The name filtrated through all the Gentile nations, and came to be the designation of the entire race of Abraham. (Cries of "No, no.") I will prove it. (Cries of "No, no," and applause.) Well, listen to the proof. I will not ask you to accept it on my assertion but I do ask you to bow to proof.

I first call Josephus as a witness, concerning whom Mr. Hine made a singular

remark last night, that he believed him only in so far as he could make him serve his purpose—a remark, I think, that will not commend itself to the audience as one characteristic of wisdom or candour. (A voice: Josephus is no authority). No authority! Why, listen to this: here is a bishop's opinion of him (Bishop Porteus), and I will say it is the opinion that every competent man will form if he will make himself intimately familiar with Josephus' book. (A voice: "The Bible.") I will give you the Bible presently. There is a time for everything. The time now is a time for Josephus, or rather for Bishop Porteus' opinion of him. "The fidelity, the veracity, and the probity of Josephus are universally allowed; and Scaliger in particular declares that not only in the affairs of the Jews, but even of foreign nations, *he deserves more credit than all the Greek and Roman writers put together*. Certain at least it is, that he had the most essential qualification for an historian—a *perfect and accurate knowledge of all the transactions which he relates*; that he had no prejudices to mislead him in the representation of them; and that, above all, he meant no favour to the Christian cause." Now, Josephus lived 1,800 years ago, and he certainly is in a position to tell us how the case stood with regard to the designation by which the universal race of Israel was known. I will read you one or two brief extracts from his writings on that point. In the first place, what is the name of his book? The *Antiquities of the Jews*; not the *Antiquities of Israel*, though he might have said that: for the whole twelve tribes were Israelites, and sons of Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel. Perhaps you will say he means the *Antiquities of the Kingdom of Judah*. Not at all. To what does that narrative extend? Does it begin with the revolt under Rehoboam? Does it begin with the formation of the Kingdom of Judah? According to the name of the book, on Mr. Hine's theory, it ought to do so. Instead of that it goes back to the very beginning of the national history. It presents to you Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It gives you the history of Moses. It takes you through all the time of the Judges and the Kings. In fact, it presents to you the history of the race of Israel in its completeness. Hence, in Josephus' estimation, the term "Jew" was applicable to the whole race. (Cries of "No, no.") I am not resting on this argument. I merely tell you it would be a legitimate argument; but I do more than that, I show you that that argument is borne out by Josephus' employment of the term "Jew" throughout his history.

In his *Discourse against Apion* (Book I., section I) he begins with these remarks: "I suppose that by my books of the *Antiquities of the Jews*, most excellent Epaphroditus, I have made it evident to those who peruse them, that *our Jewish nation* is of VERY GREAT ANTIQUITY, and had a distinct subsistence of its own originally; and also I have therein declared how WE came to inhabit this country wherein we now live." "We," the Jews. In *The Wars of the Jews* (book 5., ch. 9, sec. 4), he says: "When was it that God, who is the Creator of *the Jewish people*, did not avenge them when they had been injured?" Then he refers to the King of Egypt, and says he "bestowed both silver and gold on the Hebrews, as on a people beloved of God." The "Jewish people" and the "Hebrews," you see, he uses as interchangeable terms. "Take notice," says he—this is in a speech that he

made to the Jews from the outside of the walls of Jerusalem (*Wars of the Jews*, 6, ch. 2, 1): "That I, who make this exhortation to thee, am one of *thine own nation*; I, who AM A JEW, do make this promise to thee." He was making this speech to John, of Gischala. This Gischala was in Galilee, and therefore John, as a native of Gischala, according to Mr. Hine's theory, was of the tribe of Benjamin, and therefore not a Jew; but you see, in Josephus' estimation, John was a Jew, and himself, Josephus, too—both belonging to one nation.

This term "Jew" not only diffused itself in general use throughout the earth as the name of the descendants of Jacob, but came actually to be historically employed as descriptive of them in times before the separation of the ten tribes had taken place, and before the term "Jew" came into existence. Thus, in speaking of Samuel's days, Josephus describes them as Jews in this extract: "*The Jews* were caught in distressed circumstances, as neither having their weapons with them, nor being assembled there in order to fight" (*Antiquities*, 6, ch. 2, 2). "When Samuel had heard this, he called *the Jews* early in the morning, and confessed to them that he was to ordain them a king" (*Antiquities*, 6, ch. 3, sec. 5). It was to the twelve tribes he made that communication, and here he styles the twelve tribes "the Jews." Nay, David he styles "the King of the Jews;" for referring to David, he says: "The King of the Jews never permitted himself to do anything without prophecy and the command of God" (*Antiquities* 7, ch. 4, 1). So, that according to Josephus, David was King of the Jews, which must be strange in the eyes of Mr. Hine.

Then Josephus uses the name Jew as applicable to Israel in their very beginning, viz., when they came out of Egypt. Thus he remarks: "Manetho says that *the Jews* departed out of Egypt in the reign of Tethmosis, 393 years before Danaus fled to Argos. * * * Solomon himself built that temple 612 years after *the Jews* came out of Egypt" (*Apion*, II., sec. 2). So, that according to Josephus, the term "Jew" was not only general throughout the world, but can be taken historically backwards and applied to them before the division took place, and before ever the term "Jew" had a technical existence. Then we find him saying: "Our first leaders and ancestors were derived from them (the Chaldeans), and they do make mention of *us Jews* in their records, on account of the kindred there is between us. * * * Some of the Greek writers—he says,—have made mention of *us Jews* also" (*Apion*, I., sec. 13). *That this phrase "us Jews" comprehends the ten tribes,—that Josephus claimed those ten tribes as part of this Jewish race, this Hebrew nation, is evident from the Preface to his War*, sections 2 and 3, in which, giving an account of the extraordinary resistance of the Jewish nation to the Roman arms, he says: "The Jews hoped that all of THEIR NATION, *which were beyond Euphrates*, would have raised an insurrection together with them." He also adds: "Those of *our nation*, BEYOND EUPHRATES, with the Adiabeni, by my means, knew accurately both when the war began, what miseries it brought upon us, and after what manner it ended." Then, as showing that by this people beyond the Euphrates, whom he claims as part of the Jewish nation, he means the ten tribes,

I quote the following from Book 11 of *The Antiquities*, ch. 5, section 2: "Esdras sent a copy of it,"—that is, a copy of the letter he had received from the king,—“to all those of *his own nation that were in Media*, and when *these Jews* had understood what piety the king had towards God”—these Jews that were in Media!—that is, where the ten tribes were—“and what kindness he had for Esdras, they were all greatly pleased; nay, many of them took their effects with them, and came to Babylon, as very desirous of going down to Jerusalem; but then the entire *body of the people of Israel* ('Jews' and 'Israel' used interchangeably) remained in that country; wherefore, there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while THE TEN TRIBES *are beyond Euphrates till now*, and are an immense multitude and not to be estimated by numbers.”

Now, all this constitutes proof I promised; that in the knowledge of Josephus, all the tribes of Israel in his day were currently, politically, and conventionally known as Jews. But, I will come to an argument which will be more congenial perhaps to those who called for the Bible. Here it is, and if there is any difference between the two arguments, this, perhaps is the more conclusive of the two. In the first place, when Paul speaks of the human race in its great divisions, in its general classes, he always contrasts Jew and Gentile, and never introduces Israel as a separate element from Jew. Here are my proofs. Romans 3:9; “We have before proved *both Jews and Gentiles*, that they are all under sin.” Romans 10:12; “There is no difference between *the Jew and the Greek*.” Romans 9:23, 24; “Vessels of mercy which He had before prepared unto glory, even us whom He hath called, *not of the Jews but also of the Gentiles*.” Romans 2:9, 10; “Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of *the Jew first and also of the Gentile*; but glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to *the Jew first, and also to the Gentile*.” Romans 3:29; “Is He the God of *the Jews only*? Is He not *also of the Gentiles*.”

And now I give you New Testament illustrations of the fact that the term “Israel” is interchangeable with the term “Jew,” for the simple reason which I explained early in my remarks, that the Jewish section of the House of Israel were no less Israel than the ten-tribed section, but were merely designated the House of Judah or Jews for convenience of discourse. The land of the Jews, you will find in Matthew 2:20, is described as “the land *of Israel*.” In Matthew 8:10, Jesus, speaking of the smallness of the faith He had found among the Jews, says: “I have not found so great faith, no, not *in Israel*.” Speaking of the Jews having been helped by the birth of Christ, Mary says, Luke 1:54; “He hath holpen His servant *Israel*.” *Zacharias, who was a priest, and therefore a Jew, even according to Mr. Hine's theory—there is no escape about Benjamites in that case—says, in Luke 1:68; “That the Lord God of Israel hath visited and redeemed His people.*” Many of the Jews turned at the preaching of John, and the angel who appeared to Zacharias, predicting that fact, says (Luke 1:16); “Many of the children of *Israel* shall he turn to the Lord their God.” Paul, addressing the Jews, in Acts 13:17,

says: "The God of *this people of Israel*." That he was addressing the Jews there can be no doubt, as you may see by looking at verses 42 and 45, where we are told that the Jews opposed themselves and blasphemed, and threw dust into the air, etc., which I think last night Mr. Hine said was the particular attitude of the Jews, causing him to look with hopelessness on all missionary operations towards them. Again, the Jews speaking one to another in the temple cloisters, urging one another to apprehend Paul, said: "Men of Israel, help" (Acts 21:28); and they apprehended Paul, and they were Jews, by Mr. Hine's own admission—Jews and "men of Israel." In Acts 22:3, Paul says: "I am a Jew;" and in Romans 11:1: "I also am an Israelite," an interchangeable description. Jesus, several times in the course of the narrative of His life, is described as "King of the *Jews*"; and He is also described (Mark 15:32; John 1:49) as King of Israel, King of the Jews, and King of Israel; no contradiction, because they are both the same thing; they are all Jews, and they are all Israel. Speaking as a Jew, in Acts 26:7, Paul says: "*Our TWELVE TRIBES*, instantly serving God day and night," have this great hope to come concerning the promise made to the fathers. And when he arrived in Rome as a prisoner, he sent for "the chief of *the Jews*," and said, "I have sent for you to see you: because, that for *the hope of Israel*, I am bound with this chain" (Acts 28:20). All this is conclusive.

The next point is, that you will find there is the same interchangeableness of terms in spiritual use. Mr. Hine will please not suspect me, as I suppose he will not, of intending by that remark to lend the least countenance to any such theory of spiritual Israelitishness as he condemned in his closing remarks. There *is* a spiritual Israelitishness.

TIME CALLED

Oh! I have a statement to make here. This evening, before the commencement of the proceedings, Mr. Hine asked me to excuse him putting questions to myself. The next quarter-of-an-hour belongs to him to put questions to me. Now, if he likes, as my argument is unexhausted, I will occupy the quarter-of-an-hour for him by continuing my remarks; but if he is prepared to put questions, I will sit down.

MR. HINE:—Honestly, I am far more gratified than any of our friends now before me, at hearing the remarks of Mr. Roberts, and though, when I said to him, as I did: "Will you let me make a speech—instead of being a barrister before you, putting you on trial as it were, by asking you questions"—he said "No;" yet I will gladly hear Mr. Roberts continue his address for my next quarter-of-an-hour. (Applause.)

MR. ROBERTS OCCUPIES MR. HINE'S QUESTION TIME

MR. ROBERTS (resuming his address): I was remarking that there is such a thing as spiritual Israelitishness. I may define it very briefly. It is a matter that might be

spoken of at length with profit, but this is not the time. I will therefore say that spiritual Israeliteship consists of the adoption of Gentiles into that abiding commonwealth of Israel, which consists of all of Israel's generations who are like Abraham in faith and obedience. These are to be manifested in the earth together at the appearing of Christ to raise them from the dead and establish the promised inheritance. Gentiles are adopted among them in the sense and manner referred to by Paul, in the 2nd chapter of Ephesians, where he says: "Ye"—Gentiles of Ephesus, who have believed the Gospel—"are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God." At one time, before the Gospel came to you, you were strangers from the covenants of the promise and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel; but now, he says you are no longer in that position, but in Christ (for as many as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ); you are adopted into the family of Abraham, and are therefore Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. (See Eph. 2:11-13, 19-22; Gal. 3:27-29.)

For that spiritual Israeliteship I should certainly contend with all the strenuousness which it is possible for any human being to throw into any cause whatever; but that is a totally different thing from a theory that fritters away the promises made to the nation of Israel by attempts to substitute the church or any other body for the people that God brought out of Egypt; who, though not all of them true Israel, contain the true element. With that nation God has not yet done. Their preservation amongst the populations of the world is proof that He is true to His promise that He would preserve them, and He has preserved them for a great purpose that He has for them in the time to come.

But not to digress, there is such a thing as a spiritual Israel, and I found an argument on the Jew question on the fact that in that relationship also, the terms Israel and Jew are used interchangeably—as expressing one and the same thing spiritually, as I have shown they are now one and the same politically and socially. In Romans 2:29: "He is a *Jew*, that is *one inwardly*." I wonder what Mr. Hine would make of that with his understanding of the word Jew. Again, in Rev. 2:9, and 3:9, Jesus speaks of those "who *say they are JEWS* and are not, but do lie." The interchangeable term Israel, in spiritual use, is found, in Galatians 6:16, where we read: "Peace be on them, and mercy, and upon *the Israel of God*," a benediction directed to a Gentile community, and therefore constituting an instance of what I say, that the term Israel, like the term Jew, is spiritually applied in an interchangeable way, the same as in its use with the natural seed of Abraham.

Now, in what way does Mr. Hine attempt to evade the force of this really irresistible argument? By what means does he attempt to dispose of this really irrefragable evidence? By a most extraordinary theory about the tribe of Benjamin: to which I shall now have to direct your attention in a critical manner for the purpose of showing its utterly unfounded character. He says that Benjamin, which was united with Judah in forming the kingdom of Judah, was in

reality one of the ten tribes, and so technically "Israel" in the midst of Judah, and that all the statements as to Israel, some of which I have quoted, apply only to the Benjamites in the House of Judah, and not to the members of the tribe of Judah at all. At first, people are staggered with this manoeuvre. Let us examine it, and we shall find it nothing more than an audacious invention, utterly inconsistent with the facts of the case.

To show this, it will be necessary for me to call your attention to the constitution of the kingdom of Israel under Moses in their twelve tribes, with regard to one of two peculiarities of which, judging from his remarks last night, Mr. Hine, with all respect, did not seem to have become enlightened. There were twelve sons of Jacob, and in the ordinary course, these twelve sons would have constituted the basis of the twelve tribes, of which, in the Divine purpose, it was intended to constitute the kingdom of Israel. But the ordinary course was not observed: an incident transpired in Egypt in the life of Jacob which was a providential preparation for a certain national necessity afterwards experienced under Moses in the Wilderness. I refer now to what you read in Genesis 48:5. Joseph, you will recollect, had been sold into slavery in Egypt, and separated from his family for many years. Jacob and Joseph's brethren had afterwards gone down to Egypt and were comfortably settled under Joseph. Joseph introduces his two sons to Jacob before Jacob's death, and Jacob says concerning them, "Now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, who were born unto thee in the land of Egypt before I came unto thee into Egypt, *are mine*; as Reuben, my first-born, and Simeon, *they shall be mine*. And thy issue which thou begettest after them, shall be thine." And he says afterwards (verse 16), "Let *my name be named on them*." So that Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph, were adopted as sons of Jacob. We never read of Joseph having any other children. We read of "the children of Joseph" in the various enumerations which afterwards took place, but it is always explained that by these are meant the children of Manasseh and Ephraim, these two constituting the heads of two tribes. Joseph's two sons were to be peoples, both of them, and upon that an argument is founded by Mr. Hine which I will not follow in its details: I will merely direct your attention to the very obvious meaning of the promise. In the ordinary course of family development, these two boys would have had their individuality merged in the tribe of Joseph: Joseph would have been the head, and Manasseh and Ephraim would never have been heard of; but an exception to the whole family arrangement of the House of Jacob was made in this case. These two boys were separated, and placed upon an equality with Reuben and Simeon and Judah and the other sons of Jacob, and were thus to be two separate peoples instead of amalgamations with Joseph's family.

By this arrangement Joseph himself was placed upon an equal patriarchal rank with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The meaning of this separation of Joseph's two sons became apparent afterwards. The kingdom of Israel was to be a kingdom consisting of twelve divisions springing from the sons of Jacob—twelve peoples in

one,—a bundle of nations in one—a company of nations, which by Mr. Hine is gratuitously made to apply to the colonies of Great Britain. But the family of Levi was wanted for the priesthood and its service. This would reduce the number of tribes to eleven, where twelve were wanted. How was this to be obviated? The separation of Joseph's sons—Ephraim and Manasseh, as the heads of two tribes, answers the question. In the days of Moses, we find him leading the immense multitude into their tribeships, and we are not left to speculate as to who the twelve tribes are. I will call your attention to the very abundant and distinct information and illustration we have upon that subject.

In the first place we have the numbering of the congregation of Israel, both at the beginning of the forty years' wandering in the Wilderness, and at the end. The numbering was done in tribes, and we have the tribes enumerated. They are enumerated several times. There is no room for mistake. They are—Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Reuben, Simeon, Gad, Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, Dan, Asher, Naphtali. *Joseph* is not there (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear), but his two sons are (Mr. Hine: No, no). What? EPHRAIM and MANASSEH, are they not the two sons of Joseph? *Levi* is not there. Why not? Look at the 3rd chapter of Numbers, verse 6, and you will see the reason, to which I have already alluded: "Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the priest, that they may minister unto Me." Verse 9: "And thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron, and unto his sons: *they are wholly given unto him out of the Children of Israel,*" and accordingly in chapter 2, verse 33: "The Levites were NOT NUMBERED AMONGST THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL," for they were separated entirely to the Levitical services, and when the time came to divide the land for inheritance to the tribes, it was divided to *the twelve enumerated tribes*, but the Levites had no inheritance, but had cities distributed to them out of all the portions of the tribes, that they might perform the services of their priesthood.

Therefore we have to deal with a divinely illustrated constitution of the nation of Israel in the twelve tribes. I may, perhaps, afterwards have to show you more particularly who they are, and that Benjamin was not one of the ten separated from the kingdom of Judah. Meanwhile, let me call your attention to the frequency with which we have the twelve-tribe feature of the constitution brought out.

We have first the arrangement for numbering them; it was not done by Moses alone: he had assistants; and you will find their names in the 1st chapter of Numbers, and they are introduced as "*a man of every tribe*"—twelve men. There is no man for Joseph among them, except the representatives of the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim, and there is no one to represent the tribe of Levi. There is one man for each of the twelve tribes I have already enumerated.

Then again you have the twelve tribes organised in camps. You will find that the tabernacle was pitched in the middle; and there were three tribes on the north, three tribes on the south, three tribes on the east, and three tribes on the west. Their names are given: their names are all here. You will find the particulars in the

2nd chapter of Numbers. I have already read them; I need not occupy time in repeating them.

The time came when the tabernacle being finished had to be reared up and sanctified, and the princes of the tribes of Israel came with an offering to dedicate the altar and the tabernacle; a prince for each tribe—and who were they that offered? Their names are given. Here they are (Numbers 7): (1) For the tribe of *Judah*, Nahshon; (2) for the tribe of *Issachar*, Nethaneel; (3) for the tribe of *Zebulun*, Eliab; (4) for the tribe of *Reubeun*, Elizur; (5) for the tribe of *Simeon*, Shelumiel; (6) for the tribe of *Gad*, Eliasaph; (7) for the tribe of *Ephraim*, *Elishama*; (8) for the tribe of *Manasseh*, Gamaliel; (9) for the tribe of *Benjamin*, Abidan; (10) for the tribe of *Dan*, Ahiezer; (11) for the tribe of *Asher*, Pagiel; and (12) for the tribe of *Naphtali*, Ahira. *Levi* is not there. *Joseph* is not there, but his sons, *MANASSEH* and *EPHRAIM* are there. Therefore, *Manasseh* and *Ephraim* are elements in the twelve tribes of Israel as divinely constituted.

Then came the time when spies had to be sent to see the country. How many were sent? Twelve men. Who were they? A man of each tribe; their names are given. You will find them in the 13th chapter of Numbers. They are the same tribes as those already enumerated. This matter is illustrated perpetually.

They were numbered a second time at the end of the forty years; there were again twelve men to help; there were again twelve tribes numbered; the twelve tribes are the same.

And so the thing goes onward and downward until we come at last—for here I must make a jump, inasmuch as time does not admit of our tracing the matter right through, as I had prepared myself to do—we come to *the future time of the restored kingdom of Israel*, under a monarchy it is true—but not under a British monarchy—but under a monarchy appointed by God in the son of David, who was crucified on Calvary with His title written over Him “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews.” I say, when that time comes, you have again a division of the land, and the allotment of its inheritance to the twelve tribes. And what tribes are they? You will find the enumeration in Ezekiel, the 48th chapter, from the 1st verse. The tribes mentioned are: Dan, Asher, Naphtali, *Manasseh*, *Ephraim*, Reuben, Judah, Benjamin, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun, and Gad: the same twelve that were organised into a nationality when Moses brought them out of Egypt, the twelve that are perpetually referred to in the whole of the Scriptures as “our twelve tribes.” The tribe of Levi is again placed around the sanctuary, as under the Mosaic arrangement; but this time instead of being scattered up and down the land of Israel, they have habitation in the holy portion of the land, set up apart in the middle of the country for the Divine encampment.

All this may be very dry, but it has a vital bearing on the argument of Mr. Hine on the subject of Benjamin and the “Israelites,” spoken of in the New Testament. To see this, let us go to the days of Rehoboam, when the division of the kingdom took place. How many and what tribes did Jeroboam get? Let us patiently follow this—that we may see the position of Benjamin and the extraordinarily ingenious

shift by which Mr. Hine endeavours to evade the whole of the New Testament and other scriptural evidence, as showing that Israelite and Jew are alike. In I Kings, 11th chapter, verse 29, this incident is recorded: "When Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him in the way; and he had clad himself with a new garment; and they two were alone in the field: and Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him, and rent it in twelve pieces: and he said to Jeroboam, *Take thee TEN PIECES*: for thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, *and will give TEN TRIBES to thee*, but he shall have one tribe — (he, the king of Israel, belonging to and representing the tribe of Judah, shall have one in addition to himself, one of the twelve — Benjamin, making two — Judah and Benjamin); he shall have one tribe, for this reason: "For David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel". If Benjamin had not been given to Judah, David's royal house in Jerusalem would have been extinguished; for Jerusalem was in the portion of Benjamin. Ten tribes were given to Jeroboam; one to the House of David, of Judah, constituting with Judah the kingdom of Judah. Hence, we always find Judah and Benjamin associated in the subsequent history of the kingdom of Judah. Now what tribes were these ten that were handed over to Jeroboam? We have not the list set out particularly in one place, but we get at them in this way: in the history of the ten tribes you find incidentally mentioned, here and there, all the tribes that went to constitute the kingdom of Israel.

TIME CALLED.

It was now Mr. Roberts' part, according to the programme, to question Mr. Hine for a quarter-of-an-hour.

MR. HINE:—I have been exceedingly courteous to Mr. Roberts in allowing him to speak, instead of my questioning him; and now may I ask of Mr. Roberts to be equally generous with me, and relieve me from being under the burden of his questioning, and give me a speech for the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN (after a pause): How is it to be?

MR. ROBERTS:—I abide by the programme.*

MR. HINE:—Oh! Mr. Roberts abides by the programme! Go on, Mr. Roberts.

*Mr. Hine claims generosity for his omission to question Mr. Roberts, and suggest discourtesy in Mr. Roberts adhering to the programme. This is the wrong way to put it. Mr. Hine requested to be relieved from the necessity of putting questions to Mr. Roberts. Mr. Roberts complied, on condition of being allowed to occupy the time. If generosity is in the question at all, it was on that side that granted Mr. Hine's request. Because Mr. Hine chose to surrender a quarter of an hour, which he felt it inconvenient to occupy, that was no reason why Mr. Roberts should allow Mr. Hine to evade the most important test in the debate.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE

114.—Why did Paul call the chief of the Jews together when he arrived in Rome?—I don't know. I do not believe he did call the chief of the Jews together.

115.—You do not believe he did?—No.

116.—Then what do you understand this to mean: "It came to pass that after three days"—upon his arrival in Rome—"Paul called the chief of the Jews together" (Acts 28:17)?—I believe that Paul went after the people called to be saints in the midst of Rome.

117.—Why did he call the chief of the Jews together?—I believe that Paul was after his own brethren.

118.—Why did he call the chief of the Jews together?—I don't know.

119.—Will you accept Paul's explanation?—Oh! I shall be glad.

120.—"For this cause therefore have I called for you, to see you, and to speak with you, because that FOR THE HOPE OF ISRAEL I am bound with this chain" (Acts 28:20). My question is: What had the Jews to do with the hope of Israel, according to your theory?—I can see a very good reason why Paul called the chief of the Jews together, because they were really a dominant power over the people of Israel divided and separated from the Jews.

121.—What had they to do with the hope of Israel?—Oh, the Jews and the ten-tribed people together have to do—as one nation, together with the Jews, have yet to do, with the hope of Israel.

122.—Then do you believe that the Jews are part of Israel?—Answer: Mr. Hine has never denied that; I may say Mr. Hine would never be such a fool.

123.—Then why did you say to-night that God told off Israel to honour, but the Jews to dispersion and shame?—Because God requires the ten tribes to come again into contact with the two, and the two sticks to form no more two nations or two kingdoms at all.

124.—If the two tribes are part and parcel of Israel, how can you keep them out of the promises to Israel?—Because God has told off one house for honour, and the other house for dishonour.

125.—Where is the evidence of that?—Because God declared: "Behold My servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold, My servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold, My servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; behold, My servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto My chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call His servants by another name."

126.—Do you call idolaters servants of God?—Well, God required the people of Israel to be in idolatry, and yet to be the people He had covenanted with. (A Voice: "Proof.")

127.—Where has God required His servants to be idolaters?—God required Israel to be in idolatry at the time they arrived in the isles, because He would strip them as in the Wilderness.

128.—Where does He say they would arrive in the isles?—You have in Scripture: “Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken ye people from far: He that scattered Israel will gather him.”

129.—(*Turning to the Bible, and reading.*)—Is this the verse that you rely upon as proving that idolatrous Israel were to arrive in the isles: “Listen O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people from far; The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name. And He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of His hand hath He hid me” (Isaiah 49:1, 2). Who is speaking there?—Oh, He is speaking of Israel in the isles.

130.—I ask, who is speaking?—God Almighty.

131.—(*Continues reading.*)—“And said unto me, Thou art My servant O Israel” (verse 3). Does God Almighty say that God said to Him, “Thou art My servant?”—Yes, God says that Israel should be His servant. Israel could never be a servant to any other people.

132.—The speaker says, “God hath said unto ME, thou art My servant, and you say the speaker is God?—Yes, I do; because if God inspires a man to put forth certain statements, it is not the man that speaks, but it is God Almighty.

133.—Then my question is, How can God Almighty say to God Almighty. “Thou art My servant, O Israel?”—I do not believe that God ever addresses Himself.

134.—Then who is addressed here?—God Almighty is addressing His servant.

135.—And who is the servant?—Israel.

136.—And Israel says, “Listen unto me, O isles?”—No, God Almighty says.

137.—Say plainly, Mr. Hine: Is God Almighty or Israel the speaker:—God Almighty is always the speaker in Scripture.

138.—You do not mean that?—Yes, I do.

139.—Consider: How can this be God Almighty speaking: “God hath said unto ME”?—All Scripture is Divine.

140.—Yes, I believe all Scripture is divinely written; but all Scripture is not about God?—I believe God Almighty is the speaker.

141.—Well, who is He addressing here?—Israel. “Thou art My servant, O Israel.”

142.—But it is Israel reporting what has been said by God to him?—No, God Almighty addresses His people Israel in the isles.

143.—Then, whether it be God, or whether it be Israel, it is a summons to the isles to listen, is it not?—No, it is not: it is a summons to the people in the isles.

144.—Precisely: and if Israel be the speaker, how can Israel be the people in the isles?—I declare that Israel is not the speaker, but God Almighty.

145.—I have read the first three verses, “Listen, O isles. unto ME; and hearken, YE PEOPLE, from far; the Lord hath called *me*.” Do you still say that the Lord is the speaker?—Yes, I do.

146.—Then do you say that God says to Himself, “The Lord hath called me?”—I am quite sure that if I instructed Mr. Roberts to give you a message from me, it is not Mr. Roberts who speaks, but my own spirit.

147.—You have referred me to this passage as proving that God says that Israel was to arrive in an idolatrous state in the British Islands?—No. I have not said that; I should be very foolish if I did.

148.—Well, I will leave the point. The audience will judge of your position in the matter, Mr. Hine. I pass on to another point, You say that it was God’s purpose that Israel should be lost?—Aye, yes, and your Saviour says so: “I am not sent but unto *the lost sheep* of the House of Israel.”

149.—What do you understand by the term “lost” in that connection?—Oh, I believe the people were then in exile.

150.—Then, by “lost,” you mean in exile?—Yes, I do.

151.—Now, will you stick to that? (Laughter.)—Yes, I do, I mean to stick to that.

152.—Then what do you mean by saying in your publication that the ten tribes were not literally lost in the days of the apostles?—They were not lost to name in the days of the apostles; and Josephus, your great authority, whom you seem to take before the statement of God Almighty, says so.

153.—But you said that by “lost” you meant in exile. Seeing they were in exile, why do you say they were not lost, if by lost you mean in exile?—They were not lost to name.

154.—I find in your *Forty-seven Identifications*, p. 8, you say that: “The ten tribes were exiled, but not literally lost in the days of the apostles. This is evident from the fact that when they (the apostles) were sent after them they found them in the region already indicated, with their synagogues abounding everywhere. * * * We read of them earnestly contending for circumcision.” (This is what you denied last night, having said)?—No, I did not.

155.—After noticing other circumstances, you go on to say: “These facts preclude the idea that Israel was literally lost, either to themselves or to others in Paul’s time.” Now, were they lost or were they not lost then?—There I give, writing years ago, in a pamphlet, the statements of which have never been brought before this meeting. Years ago, I have said that the people in Paul’s time were not lost.

156.—You have altered your mind upon that point?—No, I have not.

157.—Then you still say they were not lost?—I am sure they were not lost, in the sense of our term “lost”.

158.—They were either lost or not lost, and I wish you to say plainly?—Yes, they were in exile.

159.—The term is “lost?”—It is the equivalent to being in exile.

160.—Is that the only sense in which you use the term?—That is the only sense.

161.—You say that Jesus came to seek the lost sheep of Israel?—Yes.

162.—How could He come to seek lost sheep that were not lost?—He knew where to find them then.

163.—But you say everybody else knew where to find them?—Yes, Paul knew where to find them. Hence he wrote to the people in Rome — not Romans — but to the strangers scattered in Rome called to be saints.

164.—Do you mean that in writing to the strangers in Rome, he wrote to the natural descendants of Abraham?—Yes, I do, the very people separated from all other people by the copyright term of “saints,” people separated to be called by that name.

165.—What did he mean then, in writing to those people, saying: “I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office” (Romans 11:13); “I would not that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened unto Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in (verse 25).” How came he to write to Israel after the flesh in those terms?—Quite right and proper, because he is seeing the future, whereby blindness in part should happen to Israel.

166.—To whom was he writing?—To Israel.

167.—Why did he say to them he was the Apostle of the Gentiles?—By styling himself the Apostle of the Gentiles, he did not say that his great mission was not after the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

168.—Then what did he mean by saying: “As concerning the Gospel *they* are enemies for *your* sakes, but as touching the election they are beloved for the fathers’ sakes (Romans 11:28). Of whom is he speaking then?—Of the Jews.

169.—Not of Israel?—Not of Israel.

170.—Then if that be so?—I am quite sure it is so.

171.—Then if it is the Jews, let it be the Jews, and now listen to this: Well, if you say it is the Jews—

172.—I am asking you: now do you stick to that?—Yes.

173.—That it is the Jews?—Yes.

174.—And not Israel?—And not Israel.

175.—“For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but *life from the dead*,” which you apply in your *Magazine* to Israel?—Yes; and that passage does not apply to the Jews at all.

176.—Is not Paul speaking of one Israel throughout the whole of that chapter?—No, certainly not: he is speaking of one vessel unto honour, and another vessel unto dishonour. Hence if one is for honour, and another is not, he is not speaking at all times of the same people.

177.—What “vessel” is he speaking of in this chapter?—If he is speaking of the

vessel to honour, I am quite sure he is speaking of the ten-tribed people of Israel?

178.—Why are you quite sure?—Because God appointed them to it.

179.—But why are you sure that Paul is speaking of them?—I am sure he is speaking of Israel.

180.—But you said a moment ago, he was speaking of the Jews?—Last night I said he was writing to a people not under the law, but redeemed from the law.

181.—The letter is addressed “To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints.”—Yes, called to be saints.

182.—Who are they?—The people of Israel, and never a Gentile among them.

183.—Let us go to the history of the case and see. In Acts 28:24, when Paul spoke in Rome to the people of Israel, we are told that “some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not. And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive;” verse 28: “Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is SENT UNTO THE GENTILES, and that they will hear it. And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves. And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and RECEIVED ALL THAT CAME IN UNTO HIM, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ.” Is it not evident from this that the Gentiles in Rome (those of them who would listen) were called to be saints by the hand of Paul?—I am right down glad that the people Paul was speaking to—that is, the Jewish people—did not receive his testimony, because if they had they would have belied the prophets. Hence he told them if they did not hear God, the Gentiles would.

184.—Did the Gentiles hear?—Many of the Gentiles were converted and received in my judgment the out-pouring of the Spirit at the time of Pentecost, but never a Jew.

185.—I am at Rome—not in Jerusalem—in this chapter. Did not the Jews in Rome believe the Gospel that Paul preached?—In Christ’s time, and Paul’s time, many of the Jews believed the Gospel, but afterwards they fell away. I am quite sure that in Paul’s time, in Rome, many of the Gentiles received the Gospel, and there is no reason why they should not have done.

186.—And were they called to be saints—No, they were not.

187.—What, the believing Gentiles not called to be saints?—No, they never were.

TIME CALLED.

MR. HINE:—Now, Mr. Roberts, whose turn?

MR. ROBERTS:—It is your turn to make a speech, or question me.

MR. HINE ELECTS TO MAKE A SPEECH

MR. HINE:—Then I choose to make a speech. I have listened to Mr. Roberts, who has been trying to found an argument conveying to you the impression that Josephus is quite as trustworthy as the Word of God—an argument trying to give forth the impression that we have as much right to receive what Josephus tells us as we should have in reading a chapter from the Bible. And I declare that Josephus was wrong, and totally wrong in very many of his records of history; for a man who declares that only two tribes were subject to the Romans was under a delusion, because we know there were three tribes—Judah, Levi, and Benjamin. Josephus tells you only two. Josephus tells you that ten tribes were beyond the Euphrates—a great host that could not be numbered, and yet your own history—mark you—your British history declares positively that the tribe of Dan settled in the north of Ireland 720 years B.C. Mr. Roberts will have plenty of time, and I defy him to come forth and tear that page out of the history of your own nation from the book.

Then we say, departing from many of the ideas which have been given to us, which I really have not been able to follow—it may be my own fault; it may be on account of the method that Mr. Roberts has employed—we still claim and still adhere to the idea that we are that people of Israel, and never could receive Mr. Roberts' statement that Israel and Judah do not exist as separated peoples, but are interchangeable terms; because when God Almighty declares that the one people should eat and the other should hunger; that the one people should drink and the other be thirsty; that the one people should rejoice and the other be ashamed; that the one people should sing for joy of heart, and the other should cry for sorrow of heart and howl for vexation of spirit—when God Almighty comes forth to declare that backsliding Israel hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah, then we are bound to acknowledge that there must be an utter distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah. If we could not see that, then we are perfectly justified in stating before you, that my dear friend, whose name is Robert Roberts, and Robert Roberts is the same man—where would be the sense in saying that backsliding Roberts had justified himself more than treacherous Roberts?

Then insisting upon the distinction—because the return is yet to take place; because God Almighty declares that the children of Israel and the children of Judah shall come together; and when our Saviour says that He will save the tents of Judah before He saves the tents of Israel, we declare before you that there must be a distinction between Israel and Judah. Hence God Almighty declares of that people—the people we are in quest of—that they were in exile long after they were cast out of their land; and we all know, as we proved last night, that they have never returned. Hence God Almighty declared of that people when in exile, when lost: “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; the remnant of Jacob shall be amongst the Gentiles as a lion amongst the beasts of the forest, as a young lion amongst the flocks of sheep, who if he go through—if he declare war—

shall both tread down and tear in pieces, and none shall deliver." Hence, upon the fact that you are identical with the people of Israel—do you want a proof that when your nation—the representative of that people—the people terrible from their beginning, and hitherto, and remaining this night, a strong nation, and required by God to glorify Him—why we have a proof in the very news that you have received this day, where our brave Colonel Pearson has been relieved by the British forces, and where the Zulus have had their lesson which God Almighty required, by which you will find that our weapons have prevailed, and that the weapons of the Zulus have not prevailed; and by the same law, by the same fact, you are identical with the people of Israel.

We declare to you that you shall rectify your frontier in Afghanistan, and by virtue of your being identical with that people, there is no power that shall come in between the power of Britain and the people of Afghanistan to prevent our obtaining possession of all that God Almighty requires us to have. Hence we say by virtue of being identical with Israel, corresponding to those prophecies, we have prevailed over the Zulus, we have prevailed over the Afghans, and we have in time gone by—thank God for it—because it becomes a seal to the many testimonies that His Word is true, in that by our fives we have chased hundreds, and by our hundreds we have put ten thousands to flight, and that our enemies have fallen before us by the sword. So we say that you have always done that, and have simply done it by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel. Again, following out our declaration that we belong to the ten-tribed people, God gives to you this promise, because you possess—literally possess—the promises that are recorded in Deuteronomy, that "thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow." So you are the only nation—that promise is only given to the people of Israel—you are the only nation required by God Almighty to be so prosperous, to get such abounding wealth, whilst, by the covenant that God made with your forefathers. He gave you the power to get wealth, and by the accumulation of this wealth you have lent nearly 900,000,000 pounds of money to foreign needy states outside your nation; but you never have required to borrow of them. We say that prophecy was only given by God Almighty to the people of Israel, and He never required any other nation on the earth to comply with that promise but Israel. Hence, when you find a people literally complying with the promise, you become justified in declaring that you have found the people of Israel, and by virtue of the British nation being the only people upon earth lending and not borrowing, again we declare that you are warranted in saying you are identified with Israel.

I am sorry that Mr. Roberts—in trying to impose upon your credulity when he was narrating particulars from the last chapter of Ezekiel—that he did omit the tribe of Levi. I am quite sure that that imposture was attempted to be committed before me at Huddersfield, and that is why on some platform—I could not help it—I called the Huddersfield people, only alluding to the Christadelphians—no, it was at Birmingham—alluding to the people there—"miserable wretches." Not that we attempted to give any offence: but there are thirteen tribes mentioned in

that last chapter of Ezekiel, and the tribe of Levi is included in the number; and as showing that the time of the return has not yet taken place. Work out the details of the last chapter of Ezekiel, and you shall find the whole of the allotments—distributions of the land are differently arranged to that which was in existence in the time that Israel had possession of their land. And then, as knowing, and fully well knowing that the tribe of Levi, a grand tribe, a tribe that shall never be ignored, a tribe that has existed from the beginning as a tribe, and one of the twelve—as knowing that that tribe is still in existence, when you come to the time when the sealing shall take place, there shall be 12,000 sealed out of that tribe that shall swell up the number to 144,000; and I will declare before you, that of the 144,000 sealed, there shall not be a single, a solitary Gentile among that number, because there shall only exist 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes—bringing the total of the 144,000 without a single Gentile being included. Hence the tribe of Levi must still exist as a tribe, because the time of sealing is yet to take place and when that time shall dawn upon us—that blessed time—then Levi shall come forth as a tribe; therefore he is not lost this day.

Then we say, as far as the tribe of Manasseh is concerned, you are well aware that God Almighty said of Manasseh, you shall be a people; and that He said of Ephraim—he was only then the embodiment of the ten-tribed people—the ten tribes focussed into a nation, a nation that was to appear before God Almighty—God Almighty declared of Ephraim that he should be a great people, a greater nation than the people of Manasseh; and we say by that God required two distinct people to come forth from the same blood—the same stock; and you never could be identical with that people—the people of Israel, unless you literally applied to that prophecy. There must have been a time when the islands became too small to hold them when they should lose the people who had separated themselves away from the people of Israel—the people of Manasseh—and thank God the intelligent of the people of America are taking up this identical question by thousands, and they are speaking through Dr. Wyld and through very many of their clergy; and they can clearly see that the American people represent none other than the one tribe of Manasseh, who afterwards should become separated from Israel by their Act of Independence.

Hence in the whole of America we can see a people coming from our blood, and who has now become independent of us, because we can see the promise that was given to the fathers, that of two sons they should become two peoples, and that the people of Israel should ever remain greater than the people of Manasseh, the British people being identical with the nation of Israel—they should ever remain, by the Word of God, greater than the people of America. Hence, knowing that we have little time to spare, we would give you the idea that if you will only understand God to mean what He says, and take His promises as meaning literally the carrying out of prophecy, then you would never commit the blunder that Mr. Gladstone did commit, who, not seeing from Scripture that America would represent Manasseh, has declared that it is possible that that nation in a few years from now shall outstrip us in industry, enterprise, and greatness.

And we say by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, and by God's own Word that Israel shall ever be greater than Manasseh—they must ever be a people—a great people; but Israel, your own nation—the British nation—shall by the Word of God ever be greater than they; and that becomes a very grand thing to know that God has His hand upon the destinies of nations, and by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, you know that you shall maintain your ground, and you shall ever go forth to rule the other nations, and to insist upon God's laws, to insist upon the light of the Gospel being carried to these different nations round about the earth, because God requires you to come forth, being redeemed from Moses, to become light-bearers, and the means of blessing to all the other nations of the earth. Hence, taking up your missionary work in conjunction with Manasseh, from our same seed, from our same stock, we are the light to the Gentiles, and we do go forth before all the Gentile nations of the earth, proclaiming the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; but when the return shall take place, then, God be thanked, you shall have many nations joined to the Lord.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

188.—Mr. Hine, you have used the word "*imposture*," and employed the term "*credulity*," to define the process of my argument as relating to the division of the land to the house of Israel under the Messiah. I cannot suppose that you seriously meant that I have been guilty of imposture?—Hear, hear, Mr. Roberts, I do not.

189.—Then to what did you allude?—I hardly know.

190.—I think I can tell you. You said that Levi was to have a portion in the land as well as the other tribes. I am sure your impression upon that point is sincere, because the name of Levi is mentioned in connection with the distribution, but you certainly are mistaken in saying that Levi is to have a portion. I will read what I referred to in my speech, and what probably you had in your mind, and you will see. It is Ezekiel 45:1; 'Moreover, when ye shall divide by lot the land for an inheritance,'—I may say that this was written after the Babylonish captivity, and will therefore obviously, in the judgement of everyone, refer to futurity (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear)—'ye shall offer an oblation unto the Lord, an holy portion of the land: the length shall be the length of 25,000 reeds.' The reed, I may say, was about 10 feet in length, and the measurement of 25,000 would give about 50 miles; and we read in chapter 48:20; 'All the oblation shall be 25,000 by 25,000: ye shall offer the holy oblation foursquare, with the possession of the city'—a tract of country about 50 miles square. In this the Levites were to have habitation, but it was not allotted to any tribe. It was to be absolutely separated to Divine uses. This holy oblation of the land, separated to the Lord, corresponded to the typical sanctuary in the wilderness, which stood in the centre of the encamped congregation, and round which the Levites were pitched. So, we have this, in Ezekiel 45:4. 'The holy portion of the land shall be for the priests, the ministers of the sanctuary, which shall come near to minister unto the Lord; and it shall be a place for their houses, and an holy place for the sanctuary. And the 25,000 of

length, and the 10,000 of breadth, shall also the Levites, the ministers of the house, have for themselves, for a possession for twenty chambers," and so forth. The Levites were not to have one of the twelve portions but a place in the Lord's portion. Therefore you withdraw the term "*imposture*" in relation to my argument based upon the distribution of the land under the Messiah?—I simply declare before you that the Levites shall have possession when the time of the return to Palestine shall take place, and I find it in Ezekiel 48:22, where we are told: "Moreover from the possession of the Levites."

191.—Is that not within the land-oblation offered to the Lord?—It matters very little, because in your oblation you have the extent of two distinct districts; that is, it is like two distinct territories allotted to the other tribes put into one.

192.—But is not the land to be divided in twelve portions among the twelve tribes whose names I read, and whose names are all in the chapter; and is it not the fact that not one of those twelve is given to the Levites? That is the question.—No: the land is divided literally into thirteen divisions, the Levites possessing one, and—mark!—Manasseh possessing another.

193.—Well, I have read the evidence, and will not press that point further. The audience will judge. I ask Mr. Hine another question. Mr. Hine said, not a single Gentile would be heir with Israel of the promises made to them. I want to know how he reconciles that view with what Paul says in Ephesians 3:6: "That the Gentiles should be *fellow-heirs*, and OF THE SAME BODY, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel?"—I should consider myself an impostor if I came forth with the history of the British nation, and made circumstances and events that happened in the time of William the Conqueror to appear in the reign of Queen Victoria. Hence we declare that we never have said, as far as the Gentiles are concerned, that they will have no share in the hope of Israel. We simply say, that not a single Gentile should be among the 144,000.

194.—And who are the 144,000?—Mr. Roberts surely does not want to ask that.

195.—"The 144,000" is a phrase occurring in a symbolical book, and you have used it in argument, and I wish to know what your idea is as to the meaning of it?—Answer: Mr. Hine is quite sure that it will be a literal sealing, and that the 144,000 shall comprise 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes of Israel.

196.—Do you mean that each of those 144,000 are to be literally stamped on their foreheads?—Answer: Mr. Hine would be rather foolish to suppose such a thing.

197.—You said you considered the sealing was literal, and you will find they were sealed in the foreheads with the name of the Father.—You are quite wrong, Mr. Roberts, it does not say sealed in the forehead. The beast, the Antichrist, he shall seal his men, the subjects of his rule, in their forehead: there is no doubt about that.

198.—Here is the statement, that they have their "Father's name *written in their foreheads*" (Revelation 14:1).—But that is not the sealing of the 144,000. As far as the sealing of the 144,000 is concerned, you have no reference to the sealing in the forehead.

199.—Let us see, what I have read is unquestionably about the 144,000: Lo, a lamb stood on the Mount Sion, and with Him *an hundred and forty and four thousand* having His Father's name written in their foreheads." But, you say this was not their sealing. Well, let us see. It is earlier in the book (A voice: Chapter 7, verse 3). "Till we have sealed the servants of our God *in their foreheads*." My question is: Were they to be literally stamped upon their foreheads, because you said the sealing was literal?—Well, my reply to that is, that being in the future, and not being a prophet, I really do not know, but I do not think that it would be a literal stamping.

200.—Well, that will answer the purpose of my question, Mr. Hine. I will pass on to something else. You said that at the time of the separation of the ten tribes from Judah, Benjamin, one of the ten as you make them, was to be left in the midst of Judah as a spiritual illuminator. Do I understand you correctly or not?—Benjamin was to be allied with the two tribes of Judah as light-bearers, because the two tribes could not serve that purpose.

201.—What do you mean by light-bearers?—Gospel-bearers in the city that our Lord should choose.

202.—I ask on what passage of Scripture you rely for that meaning?—Well, I believe it is recorded in the *Kings*, and I believe it is recorded in *Chronicles*.

203.—Let us turn to the record, I Kings 15:4?—And I am quite sure of Benjamin, that it is one of the tribes of Israel; that is, not one of the tribes of Judah.

204.—The passage is this: "Nevertheless for David's sake did the Lord his God give him *a lamp* in Jerusalem, to set up his son after him, and to establish Jerusalem." I wish to ask if that term "lamp" is the phrase upon which you rely, which is also paraphrased in the corresponding narrative by the term "light." Is that the passage upon which you rely?—Yes.

205.—Then I ask whether that meaning applies in Psalm 132: 17, where it is said of Christ, or David if you will—for the argument will be the same in either case, but I believe it to be Christ: David first, and then his son. "There will I make the horn of David to bud; I have ordained A LAMP for Mine Anointed," my Christ. Where is the spiritual illuminator that has been appointed for Christ?—I do not believe at all that the Almighty here is setting forth Christ as that horn, but that David literally will come back as his seed.

206.—Does David require a spiritual illuminator outside himself?—David does require, that is, our queen, from David, does require the light of the gospel redeemed from Moses under Christ.

207.—You said you believed David himself would come back; and my question refers not to Queen Victoria, but to David?—I do believe that David will yet arise, but I don't believe that David will take the throne, because it is David's seed that is to have the possession, the custody of the sceptre, until he comes whose right it is to reign.

208.—“Until HE comes,”—how can that apply to a woman?—David’s seed can apply to a woman: otherwise, it would be a very poor Christ for Mr. Roberts.

209.—Is not Christ the son promised to David to sit upon his throne?—Yes, when the time shall come for him to reign: hence, when Mr. Roberts was trying to give you the impression when the inscription was written, “King of the Jews,” you all know that it was written in derision: that is, the people then knew he was not their king.

210.—Was not David king of the twelve tribes?—For a part of his time he was.

211.—Do you say Josephus made a mistake when he called him the king of the Jews?—Yes, I do.

212.—Do you think that Christ will rule over the twelve tribes?—I am quite sure that he will.

213.—Is he not the promised king?—Of course.

214.—If the kingdom of David is to be no more until he comes whose right it is, and he whose right it is is yet away, how do you say that the throne of David exists now?—You must have the throne of David existing as long as the ordinances of heaven and earth exist. Hence with David’s seed God made a perpetual covenant, and until our saviour shall come, whose right it is to reign, the sceptre must ever be with Judah, David being of Judah.

215.—If that be a right construction of the prophecy, how are we to understand the other prophecy that says: “At that time I will *build again* the tabernacle of David that IS FALLEN?”—Yes, we quite believe that David’s throne did fall at the time of the captivity to Babylon, and for some time after that.

216.—How then about your construction of the covenant, that it should last for ever?—Then it was taken up by the decree of God Almighty, who required simply a lapse, an interval, the same as we have had in this country in reference to Oliver Cromwell, but the sceptre must be with the seed of David, and it must be in perpetual covenant.

MR. HINE’S LAST SPEECH

MR. HINE:—Well, my dear friends, I do not want that we should go home under the impression that we are playing the fool with each other. I would go home intensely unhappy if I thought I was trifling with the Word of God; but by seeing these proofs of our being Israel—I can see three hundred distinct proofs that we are Israel—why we simply bring forth three hundred new powers—new gifts—which we impart to you; and until Mr. Roberts shall see our identity in the separation of Israel from Judah he never shall, I am sure he shall not as a Christian minister, possess the power that he could possess, if he saw in these three hundred jots and tittles, in these three hundred plain evidences as to the truth of God’s Word, see these three hundred proofs coming forth to substantiate the Word of God; why he and you shall possess a new power to go forth to the infidel,

and win him for God. I will simply ask you to go forth with this thought upon your minds: the Almighty has permitted me to go almost throughout the length and breadth of this land, and when we have shown the people how God has fulfilled, literally fulfilled, His prophecy; why! over and over again, in hundreds and hundreds of instances, we have won back the very men that the clergy had allowed to slip through their fingers. We have shown them that what God had said should be accomplished has been accomplished, and when they have seen the rational view of Scripture apart from the spiritualising notion, then they have been constrained to accept the Bible as the Word of God. Hence we want you to go home this night in the calm of the Holy Spirit, go home without bias, go home with the desire to be taught only by the Spirit of God Almighty, and when we shall meet tomorrow, which we hope shall be the most refreshing meeting of the three, we are quite sure that after our three nights' labour, you will not regret that you have come forth to help us to show forth the mysteries of the Word of God.

MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH.

MR. ROBERTS:—If there were three hundred marks of identity to prove that the British nation is the ancient House of Israel, I would not be here to stand up against it. Nay, I will say that a single identification would shut my mouth. There is not a single identification. What is an identification? It is one's ownness, so to speak, a something that belongs to yourself, that cannot belong to anybody else. You do not identify a man by what he has in common with all. All men have eyes, all men have arms, all men have many things in common; and how absurd the individual would appear in the estimation of the authorities of Scotland Yard, who, when a man was wanted, should being a man with marks claimed as "identification" which were common to all. Suppose he was able to make out a list of "three hundred marks," and said: "The man you want has brown hair, and this man has brown hair; the man you want has finger-nails, and this man has finger-nails; the man you want wears trousers, and this man wears trousers;" and so on. In this way, I would undertake to draw out a list of three hundred identifications of any man, not one of which would be a true identification, and which in the estimation of the police authorities would be simply an insult to their understanding. And I am quite sure if you take Mr. Hine's three hundred identifications, one by one, and examine them critically, you will find that they will all dissolve in your hands, like so much winter's snow.

When I was stopped in my opening address, I was arguing about the point made by Mr. Hine concerning Benjamin. I cannot hope to finish it now, in the short space of time at my disposal, but I will remind you of what I was saying, that although the names of the ten tribes given over to the jurisdiction of Jeroboam, the servant of Solomon, are not given in a formal manner, yet you do have the whole of the ten tribes mentioned incidentally in the history — the dark, and bloody, and idolatrous history, — of the ten tribes, from the day that Jeroboam

took the throne till the day that Shalmaneser led a weary rabble of captives into the countries beyond the Euphrates; and if you go over that narrative, as I have done, you will be able to pick them out.

You will find Issachar, in 1 Kings 15:27; Zebulun, in 2 Chron. 30:10; Reuben, in 1 Chron. 5:26; Simeon, in 2 Chron. 15:9; Gad, in 1 Chron. 5:26; Ephraim, in 2 Chron. 15:9; 30:10; Manasseh, in 1 Chron. 5:26; 2 Chron. 15:9; 30:10; Dan, in 1 Kings 12:29; 2 Kings 10:29; Asher, in 2 Chron. 30:11; and Naphtali, in 2 Chron. 16:4; 34:6.

There you have the ten tribes that God promised to give to Jeroboam, and in the list you do not find Benjamin, and therefore Mr. Hine's contention that Benjamin was one of the ten, and was left behind in Judah as a spiritual illuminator for the Jews, is a simple invention. He finds it on the statement that in rending away the ten tribes from the throne of David, God would leave one tribe to David "for a light". He assumes that the "one tribe" referred to (1 Kings 11:36) was one of the two, whereas it is one of the twelve (Benjamin) given to Judah, as represented by the House of David — the two and the ten making the twelve. This is shown by a sensible reading of the narrative, and conclusively established by the history of the case. The reason for leaving this one tribe of Benjamin to David was that David might have "a light". There was force in this reason, for Jerusalem, the royal city, was in the inheritance of Benjamin (Josh. 18:21, 28), and if Benjamin had been given to Jeroboam, the political light of the House of David would have been extinguished. Mr. Hine understands "light", as thus metaphorically used, to mean spiritual illumination — "gospel-bearing", to use his phrase.

My questions to him showed the absurdity of this. It is still more conclusively shown by other passages where it is used — (2 Sam. 21:15, also verse 17) — and by Josephus' paraphrase of the promise of "light" as "the promise made to David FOR HIS SUCCESSION" (*Antiquities*, Book 8, chap. 7, sec.7). Consequently the whole body of evidence that I adduced from the New Testament, going to show that those to whom Christ and the apostles preached, even if Benjamites exclusively, were Jews, synonymously described as Israelites, remains absolutely untouched. The notion that they were Benjamites exclusively is absolutely gratuitous. There is not a tittle of evidence in support of the idea; but even if it were so, it would not alter the argument, for Benjamites are uniformly styled Jews in both Old and New Testaments. For instance, Judah and Benjamin, by Mr. Hine's own admission, returned together from the captivity in Babylon. Now, what do we find? That they are called "Jews" indiscriminately throughout the whole of the account in Ezra and Nehemiah, of their return from that captivity. (Mr. Hine: No, no.)

Well, I will prove it: first, as to their captivity, in Jeremiah 52:28, we read that Nebuchadnezzar carried away 3,023 *Jews*. Then as to their return, Ezra 4:12: "Be it known unto the king" — say the friends of the Persian king, writing from Syria to Babylon — "That *the Jews who came up from thee to us* are come unto

Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad city.” In Nehem. 5:17, Nehemiah says: “There were at my table an hundred and fifty *of the Jews* and rulers, beside those that came unto us from among the heathen”. In Nehem. 13:23: “In those days also saw I *Jews* that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in *the Jews’ language*”. Esther 2:5: “There was a certain *Jew* whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, A BENJAMITE”. Here we have the particular tribe mentioned as a tribe to which a particular *Jew* belongs, and yet Mr. Hine says that when we read Israel in the New Testament, we are to understand Benjamites, and when we read Jew in the New Testament, we are to understand Judah, although here is a Benjamite who is called a Jew. (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear.) Well, if Mr. Hine can endorse that, it strikes me that his argument about Benjamin must altogether go to the wall.

THIRD NIGHT.

MR. HINE:— My Lord, Mr. Roberts, and ye Children of Israel, — And I am very glad to make a distinction between Mr. Roberts and yourselves, because he claims to be a Gentile. Hence, it would not be right for me to class him amongst the Children of Israel. We remind you of the basis laid down on the first night, that God Almighty covenanted with the people of Israel that they should be a separate people from all the Gentile nations of the earth throughout time; that is, throughout the everlasting period, and “everlasting” does not refer to eternity. We remind you that the Children of Israel comprised twelve tribes; that they exist to-day if God Almighty has kept His covenant — they exist to this day a separate people from the Gentile nations. Afterwards their circumstances were changed, and the one family, the twelve tribes, were divided into two parts, comprising the House of Israel, the ten tribes, and the House of Judah, two tribes; and we tried to place great emphasis upon the fact that, unless you could distinguish the difference between the ten tribes and the two tribes, you could not beget any right conceptions of the bulk of Scripture.

There was the difficulty about the ten-tribed people: because if at any time they have returned they would not be lost, because they could only return in conjunction with the two-tribed people of Judah. Judah could not return alone, and for people to talk about the return of the Jews and ignore the existence of Israel is simply to take a one-sided and very unfair view of Scripture. We showed you many reasons why it became utterly impossible that the return had taken place. When the return does take place the distinction must still exist, because God declares that the Children of Israel and the Children of Judah shall go together, as proving that the return, that is the second-time return, has not yet taken place. When that return has taken place, God declares that they shall no more sing about their deliverance from Egypt; then they shall sing a new song; they shall no more say, the Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel from Egypt, but the Lord liveth which brought and which led the seed of the House of Israel out of the north country. If the return had already taken place, the Jews would be bound to forget the song of their deliverance from Egypt, and be singing this new song in connection with Israel, a deliverance from the north country. As a proof that the return has not taken place, the Jews have never yet sung that new song; but are still singing the old song of their deliverance from Egypt, which they rehearse piously and acceptably before God Almighty every day in their houses.

Then as the return has not taken place it conclusively follows that the distinction between Israel and Judah still exists. Then we say if the distinction exists between Israel and Judah with their altered circumstances — and you will remember that Mr. Roberts last night was talking very largely also of the past history of the people of Israel, touching periods before their division, and positively attempting

to apply those times to their altered times, the times when the division had been effected. If I were to take upon myself to write the history of good Queen Elizabeth, and I were to take a part from the reign of William the Conqueror and a part from the reign of your most glorious Queen Victoria, and if I were to apply these passages from the different histories to the time of Queen Elizabeth, I should simply be trying to impose upon you — simply be trying to delude you. Hence we say it would not be right to take Israel when they were in existence as one family of twelve tribes, to take all their circumstances as being applicable to the time when the division had taken place, when God Almighty declared that He had broken the bands between Israel and Judah, because from that time one house — as we have already told you — and very important to see — was told off for honour and the other for dishonour.

Mr. Roberts was trying to make a very great point, which I thought very, very little of. You know the whole drift of his argument has been to make out that there is no distinction between Israel and Judah in these times, that the terms Israel and Judah are interchangeable, synonymous with each other. Hence we say, as showing that that distinction must still exist — hence Mr. Roberts is wrong — your Saviour, speaking of the Children of Israel, declared that unto them it was given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God: and then turning to the people of Judah — the Jews — He declared that unto them it was not given. Your Saviour declared to the Jews, your house shall be left desolate — that is, without Christ — until the time when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Your prophets have decreed and declared that the Lord hath — the thing is already done — that He hath redeemed Israel. The two tribes remain under Moses, the ten tribes are redeemed from Moses and drafted into their higher life — the life in Christ.

Then when we were trying, or Mr. Roberts was trying, to give you the impression, so far as the disciples were concerned, and so far as some of the apostles were concerned, that they were Israelites and Jews, laying special emphasis upon the fact that Paul himself declares that he is a Jew, that Peter himself is spoken of as a Jew, that Paul himself declares that he is an Israelite, and that Paul himself declares that he was a Gentile — a Roman; we say we do not see very much in that, because as far as that one tribe, the tribe of Benjamin, was concerned, from the time of the separation of Rehoboam from Jeroboam, Benjamin was allied to Rehoboam, that is the kingdom of Judah, and that one tribe, the tribe of Benjamin, existed for thousands of years connected with the House of Judah, the kingdom of the Jews. Hence, being in connection with that house for so long a time, Paul had every right — he was not telling a falsehood — he had every right to avow himself that he was a Jew; and yet, belonging to that particular tribe, the tribe of Benjamin, he had every right to declare also that he was an Israelite. And then again — because at that time — in Paul's time — that tribe and Judah were connected or under the Roman yoke — then again,

belonging to the Roman nation, being subject to that power, he had every right to declare himself as belonging to a Gentile nation. Hence, when he speaks of himself as a Jew of Judah, as an Israelite of Israel, and as a Gentile of a Roman — a Gentile power, he tells you why he did it. He did it that he might be common to all men, so that he might be enabled to gain some. It was his law of expediency. Hence, as far as the disciples, whom we believe to belong to the tribe of Benjamin, that tribe which had been so long allied to the kingdom of Judah — as far as they were concerned, they had every right to avow that they were Jews, and they had every right to avow that they were Israelites, there being exceptions to all rules.

Then we say there was very little in the point which Mr. Roberts wanted to make a great deal of. We come to this, that though Judah is still under Moses, and though the prophets declared that they should “stumble at that stumbling-stone” — why, if they had not stumbled at that stone, then what the prophets declared would have been wrong: then when your Saviour declares, that every jot and tittle of prophecy should be accomplished, if that jot or tittle of prophecy had not been accomplished your Saviour becomes untrustworthy; and although your Saviour, in order to comply with prophecy, saw it needful that the Gospel should first be offered to the Jews, He saw that it was equally needful, though offering the Gospel to them, that they should reject it, and though some in His time and some in Paul’s time did receive the Gospel, you are plainly told that afterwards they fell away, and your Saviour, and the Great Apostle, when he found out that fact, he gave them the reason of their falling away, and said, because it is written. Written what? Why, the prophets had written that “Seeing ye shall not perceive, and hearing ye shall not understand.” So that you come to the fact that you have had, even in your New Testament times, when the Apostle Paul himself declares of the twelve-tribed people of Israel that they were broken into two fragments: that one house was formed for honour, whilst the other house was formed for dishonour.

Then if you will take the chapters from the 40th of Ezekiel and downward, where God Almighty, speaking of Judah, declares that they are to go back to their land, and that they are to build a second temple, not in Jerusalem as in times gone by; because, if we work out that last chapter of Ezekiel, we shall find that Judah’s and Levi’s portion is not in Jerusalem, but positively in Samaria. Hence, when the second temple shall be built, it shall not be upon the old site in Jerusalem, but it shall be in Samaria, and a far more magnificent temple than has ever yet been seen. And God instructs them that when they go back and build that temple they shall take oxen, and they shall take rams, and they shall take kids, that there shall be shedding of blood, and He declares positively that upon the 8th day, and so forward, the priests shall take of your offerings, your burnt-offerings, your peace-offerings, your sin-offerings: they shall take them, and what? God Almighty declares that He will accept them under that paraphernalia, that is the economy of the Mosaic, because He says in the very last verse of the 43rd chapter of Ezekiel, “And I will accept you, saith the Lord God.” So that when we come to a

Christadelphian idea — which is one of their ideas, and I am ashamed to own it for them — that there is no salvation for any man, however moral his life may be, apart from the Gospel given to the people of Israel, we simply state that, if you will take the 43rd chapter of Ezekiel and the last verse, God Almighty declares that in a time yet to come He will accept the Jews under the Mosaic rites. He will accept them: by which they will obtain salvation. We say that so long as that chapter remains in the Bible, we have Scripture teaching that as far as the Jew is concerned he will obtain salvation and acceptance with God Almighty under Moses, and apart from the Gospel dispensation. Hence, any Christadelphian creed declaring that no man can obtain salvation apart from the Gospel is contrary, decidedly contrary, to the Word of God.

Hence we are happy to know that God requires two witnessing people, and that then at the time of the return He will have a Judah under Moses, and He will have His second witness, and His overwhelming witness — Israel under Christ. And when the Lord shall beget to Himself these two witnessing people, the witnessing for our Lord shall go forth out of all the world, after that return has taken place, when you are promised by the Almighty that then, but never before, many nations shall be joined to the Lord. Then we say, still insisting — because we have the warranty of Scripture — that the distinction of Israel from Judah still exists, we come to Mr. Roberts' "breeches". We are in search after the people of Israel, and we are looking for Mr. Roberts' "finger-nails", and you know that he told us last night that all people had finger-nails, that all people had noses, and that many people had breeches: but it so happens, as far as the breeches are concerned belonging to my people of Israel, they are of a different pattern, of different construction entirely, to the breeches that shall be worn, or are now worn, by your people of Judah. Hence it is a very grand thing to know that different people wear breeches, and have finger-nails, and have eyes, and have noses; but it so happens that my people of Israel have some part of their dress, and some part of their personality which other people have not. There is nothing very peculiar in that, because I have been told by a good lady, that as far as regards the Zulus, whom we have by the will of God and by His own instructions taught a lesson by giving them a thrashing, that though we wear breeches they do not. (Applause and hisses.)

I can hear the hiss of a serpent. I am quite sure that a man who would come forth with the hiss of a serpent could never belong to the Kingdom of God. Then we say, as far as our own people are concerned, their dress, their peculiarities, their manners, and so forth, that you shall not find any other nation upon the earth with the circumstances that God Almighty willed and that He should surround the people of Israel with, you shall not find any other nation upon earth with most of these standard purposes. True, quite true it is, that there may be some things that God Almighty has decreed should be in the midst of the people of Israel, but there are hosts of things that He has decreed shall not be found with

any other people upon the earth, things that should be peculiar things, that should only belong to the Children of Israel. Hence, not only shall they have their “breeches”, and their “finger-nails”, and their “teeth”, their “eyes”, and their “noses”, but they shall have other things which the other peoples of the earth cannot touch and never possessed. Hence we say of the people of Israel, God required them to come out a nation before Him, and Scripture never could be fulfilled — Christ’s word could never be taken as trustworthy — unless the people of Israel, the kingdom of Israel, now existed upon this very earth with David’s sceptre in full sway over that kingdom at the present time, because He required it to exist a nation, a nationality before Him for ever — that is, so long as you have the sun, and so long as you have the moon; and as you have had the sun and moon this day, so it follows that the kingdom of Israel must be a nation before God this very night.

Not only so, but Israel was to become a nation and a company of nations. This is a pair of breeches that no other nation upon the earth is wearing: this is a pair of breeches that the people of Britain only are wearing. Hence, when they went forth into their isles, as we reminded you last night, then they were to come forth finding those isles too small, too strait, by reason of the inhabitants; and what blasphemy would it be to suppose that the Christadelphian Church could ever be too small, or too narrow, or too strait, to hold those people who wanted to belong to the Kingdom of God! But as far as the islands were concerned, they were, if the prophecy was to be sure, to become too strait and too narrow by reason of the inhabitants — the multitudinous increase.

And then God promised them their colonies, and you have it in the song of Moses, that the colonial possessions should be situated in certain spots, that the positions of these possessions should be surrounding all the other nations of the earth. They were to be the measuring line, the cord of the Lord, His own people, His own inheritance. The people of Israel were to be the Almighty’s measuring line; their possessions were to surround, to belt, to circle all the other nations of the earth; and it would be utterly impossible for two nations to occupy that position. Hence God, describing Israel after they were in exile, applies the descriptions to them as occupying the sides of the earth, the coasts of the earth, the uttermost parts of the earth; and your nation, the British nation, and your nation only, are wearing this pair of “breeches”. Then we say, God requires that not only in that way should they come forth to be a people surrounding all the Gentile nations, which would make them comply with the promise — O the sacred promise! — that God Almighty gave to Abraham. Could I conceive for a moment that God could make that promise and break it? Why, if I could conceive that God could break the promise that He covenanted with Abraham, then, however much I loved Mr. Roberts, who is a minister of religion, and who does preach in his pulpit, and who does preach, in his way, the Gospel of Christ; why, when he was unfurling before me the blessed Gospel, I would say, my dear Mr. Roberts, I think you are placing a misjudged confidence in the Word, because if God

Almighty could break those covenants, He could also break all the promises you are alluding to, and that means everlasting. Hence, when God promised to Abraham that his seed should be a nation and a company of nations, I am looking to the fulfilment of that word; and when I see the word, fulfilled, then I say God promised, and here it is complied with, and in your nation; the breeches only fitting your people, because not found with any other nation upon earth — you are alone the people who have become the nation and the company of nations.

Hence, we give to Australia her parliament, we give to New Zealand her parliament, we give to Canada her parliament, we give to the Cape her parliament, and we give to our separate colonies their different legislative assemblies, and we allow them to legislate for their own internal affairs. But still it is a nation and a company of nations, for there are constitutional laws that shall bind us all; and, although we allow them the privilege of having their separate parliaments for their own affairs, they shall not put a single finger upon one of those constitutional laws unless they apply for the consent of the imperial parliament of the nation — they belonging to the company of nations. Hence, in that way, having your legislative assemblies in all your colonial possessions tied to this country, we stand this very night — God be blessed — we stand this very night, the literal fulfilment of His word — we stand this very night a sure evidence that His word is sure, because we are the only nation upon the earth existing this night a nation and a company of nations. Then we say, we should be very sorry to imbibe Mr. Roberts' idea, because many men are impressed erroneously, and I think Mr. Roberts is so impressed.

Mr. ROBERTS:— My Lord, Mr. Hine, Ladies and Gentlemen,—For the third time, Mr. Hine has spoken for half-an-hour without giving me anything with which I can properly deal as a matter of argument. We have had a very great deal of assertion, and if Mr. Hine were in the position which I heard him claim in the Memorial Hall meeting — if he had a mission from God to declare the truth upon this question, then his assertions would be entirely satisfactory, and I should not be here to dispute them. But he does not take that position to-night, nor on the two other evenings we have been together. He comes forward professing to be amenable to the facts and testimonies transpiring in connection with the history of Israel in the past — in records, sacred and profane, and appealing to that as the standard of argument. I am, therefore, in a position to follow satisfactorily what there may be in the nature of argument, but feel myself at a loss how to deal with merely a string of assertions in which he says that God says this of Israel and that of Israel, quoting detached sentences without concatenation or consistency, without referring to the parts of Scripture from which he quotes them, and without showing that the testimonies from which they are quoted really apply to the matters concerning which he is alleging there is certain meaning. I must, therefore, take a course independent of his, and recall your attention to those

simple historical facts which apparently he has failed altogether to comprehend, with regard to their bearings upon this question.

He makes a great deal of the division of the nation of Israel into two parts. On the first and second nights, I submitted not my assertions, but evidence, to show that that political division was a mere episode in the national history, without altering the relation either of the ten tribes or of the two tribes to the principles of the constitution to which they stood related, namely, the Mosaic law, which covenanted blessings on condition of obedience, and imprecated curses in the contrary case. In spite of the occurrence of the judicial division for a temporary purpose, I must emphasize the fact of the unity of the nation in its essential constitution, and in its relation to futurity. The fact that the division was to be temporary is shown by Mr. Hine himself, in recognising the prophecy of Ezekiel in the 37th chapter, verse 22, where it is said, "they shall be *no more two nations*, neither shall they be divided into *two kingdoms* any more at all." Apart, therefore, from the temporary division — (a laugh).

Well, perhaps the friends who give way to their impulses in a little smile at that, do not comprehend the idea of temporary, and do not apparently see that a nation cut into two halves for certain special reasons, may still retain identical relations to the political constitution upon which they stand: they think the ten tribes were separated for blessing — "told off for honour", as Mr. Hine phrases. I will prove that, as with regard to the two tribes after them, so with regard to the ten tribes of Israel before them, their dispersion distinctly took place under the law of Moses, and that they suffered the curses that were imprecated in that law, and because of their disobedience of that law. I have proved this point before, but I have not quoted this express statement in the 9th chapter of Daniel. Daniel, in the course of his prayer to God for the recovery of the two tribes from their Babylonish captivity, thus alludes to what had come upon all the twelve tribes. He says at verse 7:—

"O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto Thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto *all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither Thou hast drive them*, BECAUSE OF THEIR TRESPASS that they have trespassed against Thee"; and then, at the 11th verse: "Yea, *all Israel have transgressed Thy law*, even by departing, that they might not obey Thy voice; *therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath THAT IS WRITTEN IN THE LAW OF MOSES*, the servant of God, *because we have sinned against Him.*"

Now, in further, and emphatic, and unmistakeable illustration of the unity — the everlasting unity of the nation whom God chose for Himself, and whom He has not cast away as a matter of final use, but has merely driven into disgrace, as they are at this day, in punishment for their past national sins, against the time of their recovery, to which I shall have to call attention this evening — I say, in illustration of that unity, let me rehearse one or two very simple facts which must

be known to those who are Bible students — concerning whom I should like to think that they were numerous, but concerning whom my experience leads me to know that they are very few in number. There are many people who are ready to borrow notions at second-hand, from pamphlets in which mutilated Scripture is quoted entirely apart from its connections. But where are the men who are quietly, and industriously, and patiently, and intelligently, and from day to day reading God's Word as it ought to be read, and as it is commanded to be read in the book itself? There are a few here and there, and I must say they are to be found most largely in connection with that company of people whom Mr. Hine has sought to introduce as objects of contempt, although I admit that his remarks were not very harsh.

Concerning the typical investiture of the high priest — that is to say, the robe which Moses was instructed to get made — we have on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod a precious stone on each shoulder, and in these stones (six names on each) were to be engraved the names of *the twelve tribes of Israel* (Exodus 28:9, 10). The breastplate in front of the ephod was to have four rows of precious stones, and in each precious stone the name of one of *the twelve tribes of Israel* (Exodus 28:17-21). When Moses came down from Mount Sinai, and before his second ascent, he erected twelve pillars *according to the twelve tribes of Israel* (Exodus 24:4). When the question of the selection of the tribe for the priesthood was in dispute, he was instructed to deposit *twelve rods* in the sanctuary, that God might openly signify his mind in the matter by causing one of them to bud. When the twelve tribes passed over Jordan in their mission to occupy the land of Canaan, Joshua was instructed to take from the bed of the river twelve stones representing *the twelve tribes of Israel*, and to set them on the bank as a perpetual memorial of the fact of their passage. Then Elijah, after the division of the one nation of Israel into two political sections, in the mission he was instructed to carry out towards the ten tribes, having summoned them to Mount Carmel, he took *twelve stones* and built an altar *according to the twelve tribes*, as you may find in 1 Kings 18:31. Then Ezra, the leader of the Jews in their return from their captivity in Babylon — the leader confessedly of only two tribes, or three if the Levites are counted — did not recognise any separation of the ten tribes as a matter of fundamental constitution, but he took twelve he-goats for a sin-offering, *according to the twelve tribes of Israel*, as you may find in Ezra 6:17; 8:35. Then you finally have in the Apocalypse the symbol of the Jewish commonwealth in its final glorification — I mean the Israelitish, although I do not withdraw the word Jewish, for I proved its applicability last night. You have the four beasts that were employed as the symbols of the four camps into which the congregation of Israel was divided in their twelve tribes in the Wilderness (Rev. 4:7). Therefore you have the national unity, as a principle, running all through the Scriptures. It is represented in the typical arrangements of the Mosaic economy; it is represented in the emblematic acts performed by Elijah and Ezra, when they were divided into two sections; and it is expressly recognised in the finality of the national fortunes in that future

division of the land, to which I called attention last night, and to which I may have again to refer.

And now we are asked to recognise in the British people the descendants of these expatriated ten tribes. Upon what grounds are we asked to go in the face of the broad facts to which I have called your attention? One of the grounds is, the allegation that our ancestors came from the very part of the world to which these ten tribes were deported and at the time when the deportation took place. Mr. Hine repeats this several times in his publications. What is his authority for this statement? Mr. Sharon Turner. This is the historian upon whom he relies particularly in his published works. Well, what is Mr. Sharon Turner's testimony upon this point? I will submit it to you, and you will be able to see how as entirely unfounded this argument is, as those arguments attempted to be founded on Scripture. Mr. Sharon Turner says in his work (*History of the Anglo-Saxons*, 6th Ed., vol. 1, p. 100) concerning the Saxons, from whom we are derived — "The Saxons were a German or Teutonic — that is a Gothic or Scythian tribe — and of the various Scythian nations which have been recorded, the Sakai, or Sacae, are the people from whom the descent of the Saxons may be inferred, with the least violation of probability. Sakai-Suna, or Sons of the Sakai, abbreviated into Saksun, which is the same sound as Saxon. The Sakai, who in Latin are called Sacae, were an important branch of the Scythian nation". From this, it is evident that Mr. Turner is not exactly sure about our derivation. he thinks that "with the least violation of probability" it "may be inferred" that the Saxons came from the Sakai-Suna, a tribe of the Scythians. But supposing he were sure; what then?

Who are the Scythians? (A voice: The Israelites.) Let Mr. Sharon Turner answer the question, because he is the authority who is put forward. The answer that he gives is this. After pointing out that the ancient inhabitants of Europe were Kimmerians, or Kelts, of which the Welsh, Irish, etc, are the descendants — (by the way, Mr. Hine told us last night that the Welsh were one of the ten tribes! However, I let that pass) — he says (*History A.S.*, Vol. 1, page 93): "Herodotus, beside the Minor Scythia, which he places in Europe, mentions all the Eastern or Asiatic Scythia beyond the Caspian and Ixartes. These new comers pressed on the Kimmerians, or Kelts, their predecessors. These nations retired towards the western and southern extremities of Europe, pressed still by the Scythian invaders. This new wave of population gradually spread over the mountains, and into the vast forests and marshes of Europe until, under the name of Germans — an appellation which Tacitus calls a 'recent name' — they had not only reached the Rhine, but also crossed into France. Here Caesar found one great body descended from them, firmly settled, about B.C.54."

Then let us ask Mr. Sharon Turner, when did these Scythians first appear in Europe? His answer is (page 95): "The first appearance of the Scythian tribes in Europe may be placed, according to Strabo and Homer, *in the 8th*, or according to Herodotus, *in the 7th century*, BEFORE CHRIST". *In Europe!* Now, mind you, what did Mr. Hine say last night? Why, that the ten tribes (who were taken *into*

Asia in the eighth century before Christ) had, in their alleged westward march, reached Asia Minor in the days of the Apostles. (A voice: Yes.) Very well. Does not that prove, even on his version of history, that the Scythians who had, even by his own witness, reached France B.C.50, had nothing to do with the ten tribes? (A voice: No.) I am afraid our friend is not particularly sharp in his perceptions — (laughter) — for if the tribes did not make their appearance in Europe until the first century of the Christian era, how can they be the Scythians who made their first appearance in the 7th century before Christ? (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Who are the Scythians? I ask again; and in answer to that question, Mr. Sharon Turner can give us no information, for he is ignorant, and all ordinary historians are necessarily ignorant on a question going so far back into the beginning of things among the European nations. They are all ignorant except this one (holding up Josephus), who derives his information from this (holding up the Bible). I will give you the weakest first — Josephus — (laughter).

Do you know why Josephus was, that you laugh at it? Do you not know that he was the most prominent and eminent and learned Jew of the first century, the companion of Roman Emperors, the champion of Jewish antiquity against all the writers of Greece and Rome, the author of works which were read by the Roman Emperors, and sent forth to the world with the seal of their authority? (Applause.)

You are not aware of the nature of the authority you are laughing at. Let me read you his information as to the extraction of the Scythian nation — “Magog (one of the sons of Japheth) founded those that from him were called Magogites, but who are *by the Greeks called SCYTHIANS.*” Here Josephus tells us that the Scythians are descendants of *Japheth*; the ten tribes were the descendants of *Shem*. Therefore, *how can one be the other?* The information we get in the Scriptures you will find in the 10th chapter of Genesis, where, mentioning these very men whom Josephus describes it says, “The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan”; “and the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah”; and then, in the 5th verse, “*By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations*”. Therefore, the Bible and Josephus concur in telling us that the original inhabitants of Europe were descended from Japheth, whereas the ten tribes were descended from Shem. Therefore that is a complete disproof (if there were no other) of the claim of Israelitish descent for the British people.

But let us look at things a little more closely. If we are descendants of the ten tribes, why do we not know ourselves? How is it that we require a man to come forth in the 19th century to tell us who we are? Where is there a case under the whole heaven of a people losing a knowledge of who they are? Why, even in the benighted countries of Africa you will not find a tribe without some tradition of their origin and identity. Why do we not speak the Israelitish tongue? Why have we not the Israelitish physiognomy? Why are we not known as Israel? (A voice: Because we were to be lost.) Aye, so Mr. Hine asserts: and if you are content to

take his assertion as proof, then I will stop the argument. What does he give you as proof? I will go over all his passages, and you will see they are no proof at all.

We have first the passage in Hosea 1:9. Let us read all his proofs in their entirety and integrity one by one. Concerning unquestionably the ten deported, though not then deported, tribes of Israel, we read in Hosea 1:9: "Call his name Lo-ammi: for ye are *not My people*, and I will not be your God." Does that prove that they were not to know themselves? Does that mean that they were to forget their nationality? Does that mean that they were to stop speaking Hebrew? Does it not simply declare that whereas they had been God's people up to that time, that He would no longer regard them in that light, because of their disobedience.

The next passage is Hosea 2:17 — "I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and *they shall no more be remembered by their name*." Who shall be no more remembered by their name? (A voice: Israel.) That verse does not say Israel. "I will take away *the names of Baalim*" which had been incessantly in their mouths for centuries in connection with the worship established by Jeroboam; and "they" shall no more be remembered — the names shall be no more remembered. This gentleman says it means that Israel were to be no more remembered by their name. Have some regard to the grammar of the case. "They" is a plural pronoun referring to some antecedent. There are two antecedents in the verse, "her" and the "names of Baalim". It cannot be "her" that is antecedent to "them"; for a pronoun — as you know — must agree with its antecedent in number. It must be the names of Baalim that were to be no more remembered by their name. But let us suppose for a moment that Mr. Hine's reading of the verse is the right one. When was it to be that the names in question were to be no more remembered? Look at verse 15: "I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope". I presume Mr. Hine knows where the valley of Achor is? It is on the confines of the land of Israel. "I will give her [at that time] the valley of Achor" (which at one time was a cause of stumbling, when Achan stole the accursed thing) "for a door of hope, and *she shall sing there as in the days of her youth*, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt; and it shall be AT THAT DAY that thou shalt call me Ishi, and shall call me no more Baali." For it was as Baali that God was known in Israel, as you will recollect. Jeroboam set up one calf at Dan, and the other at Bethel, and said, "Behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." For "I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name" — in that day. Now, if it means that Israel was no longer to be remembered as Israel, then it would prove that Mr. Hine is wrong in applying the prophecy to the present state of things, because the time has not yet come for that prophecy to be fulfilled, for the time has not yet come for Israel to have the valley of Achor for a door of hope. Suppose we are Israel, and that this prophecy is rightly interpreted as foretelling a suppression of our national designation, then we ought not to be known as British now. We ought to be

known as Israel, because the time has not yet come for us to be “no more remembered by our name”, for the time is the time of restoration, as the context shows. Mr. Hine has, so to speak, begun the “Identity” too soon, and, therefore, disproves his own argument. Besides, look here, if Mr. Hine’s interpretation is right, and this passage means that at any time we are *no more to be remembered* by the name of Israel, how comes it that when Israel is restored, they are restored under the name of Israel, for they are settled in the land according to “the *tribes of Israel*” (see Ezekiel 48:29). The names are all given in Ezekiel, and Mr. Hine will not deny that in that day they will be known as Israel. Therefore, if his construction of the passage be right, the name of Israel should never more be revived. Why does he call us “Children of Israel”? Why is he not content with “the new name” as he understands it — the English? Why is he trying to establish the proof of our identity as Israel? Why is he trying to get people to acknowledge that we are Israel, if we are no more to be remembered by that name?

I hope Mr. Hine will not mistake my loudness of voice for anger. My perhaps cross manner, does not indicate cross feelings. It is the mere mechanical result of a naturally weak voice having to be exerted in order to make myself heard in a great hall like this. (Applause.) I appear to be angry when I am nothing of the sort. My words will not read cross, if they sound so. We have another passage brought forward by Mr. Hine as a proof that we were to lose our name. In all its surroundings it really is a disproof of the idea altogether.

It is Isaiah 65:15: “And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto My chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and *call His servants by another name.*” Well, who is it that is to be slain? See verse 11: “Ye are *they that forsake the Lord, that forget My holy mountain*, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish the drink-offering unto that number”, that is to say, idolatrous connections: “therefore will I number you to the sword.” Those to be numbered to the sword were those who forgot God’s holy mountain. Who did this? Was it not the ten tribes? (A voice: No, no!) What! did not the woman of Samaria say to Christ, “Ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship: but we worship in Samaria”, or something to that effect? (John 4). They forgot the mountain of God; they did not come up to Zion in which Jehovah had placed his name; they forsook the Lord; they turned aside to idolatry, and here is the result: “The Lord God shall slay *thee*” — the ten tribes — “and call His servants” — who are they? Observe in the same chapter, verse 9: “I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and OUT OF JUDAH *an inheritor of My mountains: and Mine elect shall inherit it, and My servants shall dwell there.*” Therefore, if this passage has any such application as Mr. Hine contends for, it means that He would dispense with the ten tribes altogether, and that He would call somebody else by another name — somebody else who were “His servants” — who did not forsake the appointed mountain of the Lord, but were obedient; and that other name is introduced unto us in its full doctrinal manifestation in the New Testament — the name of Christ,

which was established in Judah when the idolatrous ten tribes had for centuries been banished and slain.

TIME CALLED.

Mr. HINE: Will Mr. Roberts, in my judgment, be gentlemanly, and as courteous as I was last night, and allow me to make a speech for a quarter-of-an-hour, instead of questioning him?

Mr. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Hine. I have no objection to excuse you putting questions to me, but it must be on condition that you will allow me to occupy the time so surrendered.

MR. HINE QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

217.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts that this statement that has been placed in my hands in the early part of the lecture is right. A friend has written a note to me to this effect: “Mr. Roberts is not even touching the Identity”. Do you think that is true? — No; I was smiting it; that is touching it.

218.—Do you believe a question put in some form to embody this paragraph, Mr. Roberts, would be right? I do not know who it is, but somebody says: “Dr. Rugg, please call Mr. Roberts to order, because he is not discussing Mr. Hine’s theory.” — No, that would be wrong.

219.—Do you believe that you have been discussing the prophecy about the nation, and the company of nations? — I have been referring to the subject in relation to which you quote that.

220.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that you have answered me in reference to the isles to-night? — I could not do everything in half-an-hour; I did as much as I could.

221.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that in referring to the past history of the people of Israel, when they were twelve tribes united, you were touching the Identity? — Yes.

222.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that you have not this evening introduced very many points that are not connected with the Identity? — No.

223.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that baby sprinkling, and baby salvation are unscriptural? — If you think that has to do with the Identity I will answer it.

224.—No, I do not, and just because most of Mr. Roberts’ opening remarks were not connected with the Identity. Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that heathen, idiots, pagans, and very young children will never see the light of the resurrection? — If you think that has to do with the Identity I will answer it.

225.—No, I do not, because I do not believe your remarks referred to the Identity. Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that salvation is impossible without a belief

in the Gospel, however moral a man's life may be? — As you happened to introduce that subject in your opening speech, I may consider myself at liberty to answer that by saying that I do believe so, on the authority of the New Testament.

226.—I hardly understood Mr. Roberts; I shall have to put that question again. Do you believe that salvation is impossible without a belief of the Gospel, however moral a man's life may be? — I do.

227.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that if God Almighty willed that Judah should still remain under Moses, and declares that He will accept him under Moses, that he will be accepted? — “If?” Do you put it in that way?

228.—No, I do not. — Then I must ask you to repeat the question, if you do not put it hypothetically.

229.—Do you believe that the Jews will be accepted by God Almighty under the Mosaic economy? — The Mosaic economy has been set aside. (Applause.)

230.—I have not much opinion of the Bible intelligence of the people who applaud that. — Then I will give you a passage that says it.

231.—No; I don't want it, Mr. Roberts, I don't want it. Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that the Temple referred to, to be built by the reed in Ezekiel, has been built? — No.

232.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that in that Temple the Mosaical rites will be re-established? — Not as Mosaical rites.

233.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that there will be the shedding of blood? — Yes.

234.—The blood of animals, I mean? — I mean that.

235.—Do you believe that the blood of the bull will be required? — Yes, then.

236.—Do you believe that the blood of the kid will be required? — I believe all that you read in Ezekiel, and everywhere else in the Bible.

237.—Do you believe that a people that shall require the killing of a bull, and the killing of a ram, and the killing of a kid, and their blood being shed for them, that that people will have any requirement for the sprinkling again of the blood of Christ? — The shedding of blood under the law of Moses was a pointing forward, and the shedding of blood in the Kingdom of Christ will be a pointing backward to the one great sacrifice He accomplished.

238.—Do you believe that, as far as the shedding of blood for Christ's people is concerned, that His own blood was sufficient? — That is sufficient, whatever it may be, which God at any time, in any connection, appoints and requires.

239.—Then you believe that there are exceptional circumstances? — Unquestionably, there are.

240.—Then, who are the people, Mr. Roberts, that shall require the shedding of the blood of the bull, the goat, and the ram? — All people on earth during Messiah's reign. I mean all those who are subjects, I don't mean the rulers; — I don't mean those who reign with Christ — the saints.

241.—Do you believe that Christ has died for all? — I do.

242.—Do you recognise any distinction as now existing between Israel and Judah? — None, nationally; neither of them are corporate political entities at present: they are both scattered peoples.

243.—Do you believe the lost ten-tribed people are recognised? — What do you mean?

244.—Do you believe that the ten-tribed people are now in connection with the two? — Again I must ask what you mean by "connection"?

245.—Do you believe that the Jews whom we see and know, comprise the Twelve Tribes? — They do not comprise them in the bulk; there may be some scattered individuals of the ten tribes amongst them.

246.—Do you believe that the Jews have any recognised members of the Ten Tribes among them, as distinct from the members of the two? — They have no recognised members even of the two as a matter of distinct genealogy, still less of the Ten.

247.—Would you be surprised to know, Mr. Roberts, that the Cohens, the Goldsmids, and the Rothschilds have their genealogies preserved, and many other people connected with the Two Tribes of Judah? — I should not be surprised at any Rabbinical tradition, whatever.

248.—I have almost done, Mr. Roberts. Well, then, Mr. Roberts, do you believe that the people whom God Almighty required to tremble at the shaking of an aspen leaf, and to serve their enemies in all countries, and to have no inheritance — no territorial possession — but in their persons — can be the same people as the people required by God Almighty to be a nation? — The same people, certainly, in the down-trodden stage of their history.

249.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that the people that God Almighty requires to be recognised by the show of their countenance, can be the same people that God Almighty requires not to be recognised on account of their paths being hedged in and their ways being lost? — Show me a statement of Scripture which says that God requires the House of Judah to be recognised by the show of their countenance?

250.—That is a question. — Yes, but I must not answer in the dark.

251.—Yes, yes. I only put the question, because, of course, I could show the proof? — I will give you the answer when you give me the passage. I decline to answer the question unless you give me the passage, because I deny the assumption involved in the question.

252.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that, without making a statement — which you rebuked me for doing several times, do you believe that the people of Israel referred to by God Almighty to be known under another name, should be recognised by the name “Israel”? — I must confess I do not understand that question.

253.—When God Almighty declares that Israel in after days should be called by another name, do you mean that He meant their old name? — My answer is, that He never has said such a thing. He says that His servants shall be called by another name: not those who had given themselves over to idolatry.

254.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that Judah ever gave herself to idolatry? — Originally — before the Babylonish captivity, certainly; but not after.

255.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that Israel ever gave herself to idolatry? — Do you mean the Ten Tribes?

256.—Yes. — Yes, I do.

257.—Do you believe that they gave themselves more than once over to idolatry? — They were given over to idolatry all the time, and therefore there could not be twice.

258.— Do you believe, really, Mr. Roberts, that the ten-tribed people were given to idolatry always? — Yes, from the very first moment of their national existence, until they were taken away by Shalmaneser.

259.—Do you believe that when the Almighty declared that He would speak to the people of Israel in another tongue, that He meant the Hebrew? — No, I think He meant other languages.

260.—Would you acknowledge that Israel would have to forget her own language for this to be fulfilled? — I should not admit that.

261.—Would you be surprised to know, Mr. Roberts, that we have many thousand words in the Saxon which come from the Hebrew? — No: I do not believe it.

262.—Would you be surprised to know, Mr. Roberts, that Canon Lyson, of Gloucester Cathedral, has given you five thousand in his work called *Our British Ancestors*? — Yes, I should be surprised.

263.—Do you believe it to be a fact, Mr. Roberts? — Do I believe what to be a fact?

264.—That we have many thousands of words derived from the Hebrew?—No, I do not.

265.—Are you able to come forth with proofs that we have not, Mr. Roberts? — Well, if I thought the matter worthy of the effort, and were to set myself to work, I think I could.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

266.—You said, Mr. Hine, that God had told off Israel to honour and Judah to dishonour; will you please point me to the passage of Scripture upon which you rely for that statement? — Well, my dear Mr. Roberts, honestly I could not — that is to say, I could not give you chapter and verse: I can quote the passage.

267.—Will you quote it then? — Hence, God Almighty says: “Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? * * * Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?”

268.—Well, who would say he had not; but, how does that prove that God set apart Israel to honour, and Judah to dishonour? — Because we take Scripture in connection with the context.

269.—Will you allow me to give you the context, then? — No.

270.—The ninth chapter of Romans? — No, I shall not take it.

271.—I will give it? — Put it in the form of a question.

272.—Romans 9:17, 18: “For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh. Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth”! That was the case with Pharaoh, whose heart was hardened. “Thou wilt say, then, unto me, Why doth He yet find fault? For who hath resisted His will? *Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?*” (Romans 9:19, 20, 21). Is not the contrast between Pharaoh and certain persons who are described as vessels of mercy, and not between Judah and Israel. Yes, or no? — No, Mr. Roberts.

273.—Can you show me that it applies to Judah and Israel by the context? — Yes, by the context.

274.—Point me, please, to the part of the context upon which you rely as proving that that refers to Judah and Israel? — The context is by referring to prophecy.

275.—Prophecy is not the context of that statement; the context of that statement lies in that chapter, and my question is: Where is there any evidence in that chapter that that statement applies to Israel and Judah? — That chapter refers to the literal and the positive transactions of the people of Israel, the people unto whom the promises and the covenants and the oaths were given.

276.—Can you point me to the proof of that? — In the same Book.

277.—What part of it? — The Romans.

278.—What part of Romans? — I should advise Mr. Roberts not to waste so much time by requiring chapter and verse, which any Bible students may find out when they go home.

279.—But I am testing your statements, as to what the Bible says (Hear, hear.) I ask you to show me from any part of Romans 9, that when Paul speaks of one vessel to honour and another to dishonour, he means Israel and Judah. (Mr. Hine hesitates.) Then, I will take it for granted that you are unable to prove your assertion concerning that verse, and will pass on. In John 4:22, Christ says to the Woman of Samaria, in conversation with her: “Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship, for Salvation is of *the Jews*.” I wish to ask you how you understand that statement with your theory? — I do not understand it to be at all connected with the Identity of the people of Israel, because I do not recognise the Woman of Samaria as being an Israelite at all.

280.—My question is: What did Jesus mean by saying, “Salvation is of the Jews?” — I cannot understand that, really, as being connected with the Identity of Israel. In my judgment Salvation comes from Christ, who came from the Jews, that is, from Judah.

281.—You understand Christ to have been a Jew? — Certainly.

282.—Then, if He meant himself only, why did He not say: “Salvation is of the Jew” (singular number)? — No, if Christ comes from Judah He comes from the Jews.

283.—Then you do not understand that Salvation appertains to the Jews, but only to Christ? —I believe the Jews will be saved.

284.—But Christ here says that Salvation has its origin in their midst as contrasted with Samaritans? — For Israel.

285.—What! not for the Jews? — No, not in His time.

286.—Is God, not the God of the Jews? — Well, He belongs to the Jews. He is one of the Trinity, I believe that.

287.—You said last night that the phrase, “King of the Jews”, was a phrase used in derision? — Yes, and I should be very glad for you to prove it otherwise, because you could not.

288.—Do you think the wise men used the term in derision when they came and said: “Where is He that is born King of the Jews?” — I am not sure about that point, it not being connected with the Identity.

289.—You think that Christ is not King of the Jews? — I believe that Christ shall be King of the Jews, but is not yet King of Israel.

290.—He will be King of the Jews, will he? — I am quite sure that Christ will be king, both of Israel and Judah, when the two “sticks” are united, not before.

291.—You do not agree, then, with a writer in your own *Magazine* who says: “Can we wish to identify a title with the Redeemer that would only remind us of His humiliation and suffering, surrounded with contempt and scorn? No, the Messiah never was king of the Jews, and will not be in the future?” — Well, I should not agree with him. I do not agree with all the good people who try to support me in my *Magazine*.

292.—In Romans 9:2, 3, Paul says: “I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart; for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites.” Who do you think he was referring to there? — The Jews.

293.—The Jews “who are Israelites”! Then how do you understand the next verse: “To whom pertaineth the adoption, and *the glory*, and *the covenants*, and the giving of the law, and the service of God *and the promises*?” — Yes, I believe that even that will refer, in a time yet to come, to Israel and to Judah.

294.—Do you admit then that the promises belong to the Jews? — Oh! I quite believe that.

295.—If so, why do you think they are not fulfilled now? — Because God doth not require them to be fulfilled until the receiving of Israel shall take place.

296.—But you have contended that the promises to Israel are now fulfilled? — Well, suppose I have.

297.—How then do you understand this in the same chapter: “What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, *hath not attained to the law of righteousness* (Romans 9:30, 31). What does he mean by “Israel” there? — Oh, I think the Jews.

298.—Why not Israel? — Well, because he was speaking to the people of the Jews in that region.

299.—How do you know that, seeing the term “Israel” is used? — I think so.

300.—You are not sure?—I am almost sure.

301.—Then, if we may understand he means the Jews, when he speaks of Israel; how are you to discriminate between the Jews and Israel in your sense of that distinction, in other parts of Scripture? — Because I never allow Scripture to contradict Scripture.

302.—But I think you do: we shall see. Listen to this — you say he is speaking to the Jews: “I say then, hath God cast away His people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin (Romans 11:1). — Ah, that one tribe!

303.—Very well, do you say that means the Jews, or the Israelites of the ten tribes? — The ten tribes certainly, I am quite sure of that. I will not give up that point, Mr. Roberts.

304.—If so, mark this: “Israel *hath not obtained that which he seeketh for*; but the election hath obtained it, and THE REST WERE BLINDED” (Romans 11:7)? — Yes, I quite believe that. I wish you would put it, then, in the form of a question, Mr. Roberts.

305.—You did not wait for my question. My question is: Is that the Jews, or Israel of the ten tribes? — I believe the ten tribes, Mr. Roberts.

306.—Why do you make it The Two Tribes in the first place, and the Ten Tribes in the second? — Because the ten tribes were blinded: blindness has happened to them.

307.—What do you mean by blindness? — “Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in” (Romans 11:25).

308.—What do you understand by the word “Blindness” as used in that connection? — I believe that it means that the people of Britain, declaring in the Liturgy of their Church — the sublimest Liturgy under Heaven — that they are the people of Israel at the very time they are supposing themselves to be a Gentile people.

309.—Then by “Blindness”, you mean blindness to their own identity, is that the meaning? — “Doubtless Thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not” (Isaiah 63:16). That is, though they forget the rock that begat them.

310.—Answer the question: Do you understand the blindness referred to, to mean that they were blind to their own individual identity? — I believe so, and by context with prophecy.

311.—Had the ten tribes lost their identity then? — No, I am quite sure they had not.

312.—But Paul says the blindness “hath happened” unto Israel: if the blindness means loss of identity which you say is the meaning; how do you explain that the blindness was a fact in Paul’s day, and yet they still retained their Identity? — I believe they were to become a lost people; a people blind as to their Identity, and that that is the meaning of the blindness.

313.—Then how do you regard Paul’s definition of the matter in 2 Corinthians 3:13: “Moses put a vail over his face, that the Children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: *But their minds were blinded*: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament: WHICH VAIL IS DONE AWAY IN CHRIST. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart.” There Paul decides that your meaning is not his? — No, he does not.

314.—He says, “the veil is on their heart”? — No, he does not.

315.—Well, Mr. Hine, the audience will decide.—Oh, they cannot; it is utterly impossible for them to decide, Mr. Roberts.

MR. HINE ELECTS TO MAKE A SPEECH.

MR. HINE: Hence, we say we are going to take up the “breeches”. I won’t depart from those breeches. I shall always keep them as an heir-loom, and hang them on a peg; we have our noses, and eyes, and breeches, and so forth. I declare that as far as breeches are concerned to the people of Israel — the ten-tribed people — that they shall ever be found, and never could be found without, standing based upon the Ten Commandments; and if I thought, with Mr. Roberts, that I was a Gentile, I could then believe that I had not the Ten Commandments, because, if the Gentiles, who have not the Commandments — the law, do by nature, by instinct, the things that are in the law, then they become a law unto themselves. Just as Judah shall be saved under Moses, so shall heathen Gentiles, idolatrous Gentiles — though Mr. Roberts has declared bold-facedly before you and against the Word of God, The Word of God declares that even these very Gentiles, who have not the law, though they may do some things that are in the law, yet they shall become a law unto themselves. God will not condemn them, though Mr. Roberts, in the narrow groove of his mind, might be willing to do so.

But, as far as the Ten Commandments are concerned, God gave them to the people of Israel for a sign. They were to abide between God and the people of Israel for an everlasting sign, and only that people were to have these Commandments. And, if you wanted one conclusive evidence that you are identical with the ten-tribed people of Israel, it would be this: that, existing as a nation, you are the only nation upon the earth whose very judicature — whose law, is based upon the moral law of the Ten Commandments. I will swear and declare that Mr. Roberts is not able to prove, before you, that any Gentile nation, outside of the British people, have the Ten Commandments at all. Hence, we say that God would not be so — aye, let us speak reverently when we mention His name — but surely He would not commit Himself to a folly if He put a sign upon His people, the sign of the Commandments; He would never put the same sign upon all the other nations of the earth: because, if I, as a farmer, would have a flock of sheep, and I put a mark of red ochre on their backs, and I herded my sheep with other flocks; if the people who possessed the other flocks marked them with the same sign as mine, you would see that my mark, my sign, becomes obliterated. Hence, God wills that His own people shall bear a very peculiar mark, and that mark shall be the mark of the Ten Commandments, which we have to teach diligently to our children — and I am a back-bone Church-man, and thank God for it; but if I had been inclined to follow in the wake of the Dissenters, I should have torn down the Ten Commandments from the door-posts, from the walls of the sanctuary. I, belonging to the people whom God Almighty had

instructed and commanded, should have them written on the walls and door-posts — if we had been Dissenters we should have torn these down.

The Ten Commandments, then, are a mark of the people of Israel, and you shall never identify that people unless you find her in a national capacity — that is, the Established Church of her nation; and you never shall find, by the Word of God — let any man say No, he does not understand the Scripture; you never shall find the people of Israel, and identify them, unless they have a State Church, which is identical with the will of God Almighty as existing with the people of Israel in these days, until the time of the receiving of their identity shall come to pass. Hence we say, by the voice of the nation, by our own voice going forth through our National Church, thank God for it; and, by virtue of her identity, the Liberation Society can never take the Church from the State, because, until the identity, you must have Israelites' carcasses — that is, the carcasses of their kings — buried in their high places, your St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, and so forth — because Judah has never done that; only Israel in her exile could do that. Hence we say, as far as the Ten Commandments are concerned, through the State Church, the Established Church, the voice of the people, the nation, they rehearse to God Almighty, they pass the sign, just as the Freemasons pass the sign by which they are recognised when they meet. So God's people, by coming forth with His mark, rehearsing His sign every Sunday throughout the year — we pass the sign, the sign reminding God Almighty what are the covenants that He made to our forefathers; and by virtue of the passing of that sign, which Dissenters have ignored, to their shame — by virtue of the nation passing that sign, your nation — the British nation, is that very nation, coming forth by the will of God, the head and not the tail, the highest privileged nation on the face of the earth. We have passed the sign, put God in remembrance of His covenant with our forefathers, and by virtue of passing that sign, which Israel only could do, we have come out, as we stand this night, the most highly privileged nation upon the face of the earth.

We will give you another pair of "breeches": you never shall find any other nation upon the earth wearing a pair of breeches upon which is inscribed the Eastern aspect. Thank God! though I am not a Ritualist and abominate the Ritualists in my heart, yet I do venerate and esteem the Eastern position of our Church by law established. Hence, I see for once, before you, in these three nights; for once, going back to the early history of Israel when under Solomon, and when united, and when basking under the sunshine of the favour of God Almighty — poor king Solomon! he saw that people happy, contented; he saw God's blessing upon them, and yet in his wisdom he saw that they would sin, and therefore he comes forth and pleads with God and says, "If they sin against Thee, and Thou take them away from their land, wilt Thou, when they are in their land of captivity, wilt Thou, if they confess their sin, and pray unto Thee with their face toward their land" — if they pray unto Thee with their face toward the land — a contract, a covenant which God accepted — if they do this at their very first

entrance into your National Church, if we come forth and confess our sins — the very first thing in your National Church you have is confession of sins, and with their faces turned toward the East — and why the East? Because you are the people of Israel. Hence you are the only nation — the French and the Germans and the Russians do not — you are the only nation — (A voice: How about the Turks?) — you are the only nation upon the earth who, in your national worship before God Almighty, confess your sins and pray with your faces toward your land. What land? Why the land which the Lord your God gave to your forefathers. Hence, that pair of breeches shall never be found on any other people on earth; but your nation, being the only nation upon the earth, by the law of your land — and not throughout the factions of your Dissenting people, but by the law of your land, the national voice comes forth. Hence we say, that your nation is the only nation that comes forth to respect the Eastern position, because Solomon prayed to God, and God complied, and He said, “I have heard your prayer and I will abide by it all; I will make the contract with you”. Hence, when the people go forth, and in their land of exile they shall pray, whether it be near to or far off — and prophecy declared it should be in the isles afar off — hence, in those isles they were bound to turn to the Eastern aspect, and you are the only nation under heaven that really observes it in your National Church, for which God be thanked! — your Eastern position.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTION MR. HINE.

316.—Mr. Hine, you say that wherever the nation of Israel is found it must be found with the Ten Commandments? — Thank God for it.

317.—Do you consider the British nation a Christian nation? — The only Christian nation upon the earth.

318.—As such, do you consider it subject to the teaching of the Apostle Paul? — The only nation upon the earth subject to his teaching.

319.—That being the case, I ask you to consider this statement, upon which I will put a question when I have read it: “Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if *the ministration of death*, WRITTEN AND ENGRAVEN IN STONES, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? * * * If that WHICH IS DONE AWAY was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious” (2 Cor. 3:5-11). My first question is: Was anything else written and engraven in stones but the Ten Commandments? — My answer is, Mr. Roberts,—

320.—Yes, or no? — The thing done away with was not the Ten Commandments, but the —

321.—My question is: Was anything else written and engraven in stones but the Ten Commandments; yes, or no? — Yes.

322.—What besides? — Well, I believe there was an inscription on Jacob's stone.

323.—Do you think that Paul was referring to the inscription on Jacob's stone there? — No, I do not.

324.—What do you think he was referring to? — I think he was referring to the abolishing of the Mosaic law to Israel.

325.—I am not speaking of abolition, but of writing. What does he mean by that which was written and engraven in stones, which he says was done away? — I believe he is referring to what was written on the stony hearts of the people.

326.—What was written on the stony hearts of the people? — Disobedience of God Almighty.

327.—“If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was *glorious*.” Do you say that disobedience written in the stony hearts of the people is glorious? — Mr. Hine pauses.

328.—My plain question is: Is not Paul there referring to the Ten Commandments? — No, I think not. I may be wrong, but I think he is referring to the Mosaic law, which was then abolished.

329.—Was the Mosaic law written and engraven upon stones? — Not upon your sealing-wax that you introduced last night.

330.—Were not the Ten Commandments written and engraven in stones? — I take that as a figure.

331.—Were not the Ten Commandments written and engraven in stones? — Keep your temper, Mr. Roberts.

332.— I am keeping my temper admirably: I am only emphasizing my question: Yes, or no. Were not the Ten Commandments written and engraven in stones? — Well, of course I should be a fool to say No.

333.—Then the Ten Commandments being those which were engraven in stones, what about Paul's statement that they were done away with? — Well, I say it was not in the literal sense.

334.—You are aware that one of those Commandments is, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy” — the seventh day. Do we observe the seventh day? — We observe the Sabbath day.

335.—Do we observe the seventh day? — I would be very sorry if we did.

336.—Does not the law of Moses command the observance of the seventh day? — We are redeemed from that law.

337.—If we are redeemed from it, how must we be found under it? — We are not found under it. Your seventh day was renewed in the Mosaic economy; but as far as the keeping of the Sabbath is concerned, we have to go back to the Garden of Eden. I have seen the calculations by which according to the moons, and so forth, we have gone back to the original Mosaic Sabbath.

338.—But it was the Ten Commandments you spoke of: you don't think that that law which was written and engraven on stones was done away? — No, certainly not: the Mosaic law, which was given 430 years after, had no power to annul.

339.—The Mosaic law was not 430 years after the Commandments, which were part of it. "If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious; * * * WHICH GLORY WAS TO BE DONE AWAY." How do you explain that statement? — Well, I have given you my answer.

340.—Well, I will not pursue the matter further. I think Mr. Hine's position is sufficiently obvious. You say, Mr. Hine, that Israel must be found a nation to-day; what do you mean by a nation? — A people with a land, and not dispersed.

341.—Were Israel a nation when captive in Media? — God never required them to be.

342.—Yes or no? — He required them to be many days without a king — a wandering people.

343.—Yes or no: for whatever reason, were they a nation when they were captives in Media? — No, not at that time. Why! they had to break the yoke of the Assyrians off their neck.

344.—Why must they be a nation now, then? — Because God afterwards decreed it.

345.—"Afterwards"? — After their captivity, when they were positively in exile.

346.—You refer to the words of Jeremiah, spoken after the deportation of the ten tribes. When was the decree to come into force according to your understanding of the matter? — O, it came into force when the ten tribes became collected, because the nation could only comprise the ten tribes.

347.—You do not tell me when? — When the time should come.

348.—Are you sure the time has come yet? — Quite sure.

349.—That we shall see. Does not that pledge concerning the nation, and the continuance of the nation, refer to both families? — Certainly not: I am positive you are wrong.

350.—I will read the statement of Jeremiah (33:24): "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, *The two families* which the Lord hath chosen, He

hath even cast them off? Thus they have despised My people," *two families*, "that they", *two families*, "should be NO MORE A NATION before them. Thus saith the Lord; If My covenant be not with day and night", and then He proceeds to guarantee their stability.— You are skipping over some verses, as you did last night.

351.—No: I am reading the very next verse.—With a paragraph between.

352.—There is no paragraph between. I will hand you the book if you like. (*Offers the book to Mr. Hine: Mr. Hine declines to look.*) Now the question is, if Israel could be a nation, although in dispersion, in the centuries lying between their deportation by Shalmaneser and the time of Christ, why are they not to be considered a nation now, if proved to be in dispersion? — Utterly impossible for a people dispersed in all nations, serving their enemies in all countries, to be a nation.

353.—Were they not to be without a king until the latter days: yes or no? — They have been so, thank God for it.

354.—When are the latter days? — It is not "the latter days" in the passage.

355.—Yes it is.—That day was immediately after their dispersion.

356.—I will read the statement (Hosea 3:4): "The Children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice. * * * Afterward shall the Children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness *in the latter days.*" My question is, when are the latter days? — Don't put it, Mr. Roberts.

357.—I will.—You had better not.

358.—When are the latter days? — After they had been many days without a king; you have it there: abide by the Word of God.

359.—When did the latter days begin? — Afterwards.

360.—And when did the "afterwards" begin? — You don't know, but I think I do.

361.—Exactly, and that is why I am asking; when did the latter days begin? — Not until after they had arrived in their islands in an idolatrous state, as our people did, and then received Christianity, and those were the days that they were to seek the Lord, as we did.

362.—Do you mean the latter days began in the fifth century? — O, there are many days described in Scripture as the latter days, and in two verses they do not refer to the same days.

363.—My question refers to the latter days that we are now speaking of, never minding any others — supposing there are any, which I deny. Did they begin in the fifth century? — They were days afterwards.

364.—Did they begin in the sixth? — When we first embraced Christianity.

365.—Do you date the latter days, then, from the year in which England embraced Christianity? — No: from the time of James I.; and not until then did the ten tribes become really united, when we sought the Lord our God; and in our Bible it is dedicated to our late king James I., to whom all glory be given.

366.—Then you begin the latter days with the reign of James I.? — Yes, I am inclined to do so: those latter days and the latter days afterwards.

367.—If that be so, explain to me how, in the 38th of Ezekiel? — O, now we are coming to another latter day, after the return.

368.—“In the latter years thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword.” — We are not there yet.

369.—Wait a moment: “And is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste: but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they shall dwell safely all of them.” * * * “And thou shalt come up against My people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; *it shall be* IN THE LATTER DAYS” (Ezekiel 38:8, 16). Has Israel been restored to their land? — I thank God, not yet.

370.—Why not, if the latter days begin in the reign of James I.? — If the latter days began, supposing I am right — and only supposing — if they began in the reign of James I.—no man can prove they did not; but supposing they did, then we say these latter days cannot end until He comes whose right it is to reign, the second coming of our Lord.

371.—You say that Israel was always to be a favoured people. — Thank God.

372.—On what authority? — O, because He declared, “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper” (Isaiah 54:17), “thou shalt be far from terror, for it shall not come near thee” (verse 14), which, if it referred to the Christadelphian church, or any church on earth, should be false.

373.—If the Danes overthrew the Saxons in England in the sixth century, in a long and bloody war, and oppressed them for a long time till the days of Alfred, how can the Saxons be the people against whom no weapon formed was to prosper? (Applause.) I am only very sorry you should applaud, because really it shows you are not conversant with the subject. We simply say that the last tribe that arrived in these islands must be the tribe of Benjamin, because it was in Jerusalem in the days of Christ. He was to be the favoured of the Lord, and her very emblem, her heraldry, is described in Scripture — the lion and the unicorn. Hence, the Normans who came here with the heraldry of the wolf, were the tribe of Benjamin: so the Norman Conquest, so-called, was only the adding of the last tribe, to complete our nation of the ten tribes. Then we had the whole of the ten tribes in these isles afar off and from that time you never have been defeated.

MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH.

Mr. HINE: Then we tell you, dear friends, that you are the people of Israel. You are the people of Israel because you comply with all the prophecies that God declared and willed should come forth from the people of Israel, and the people of Israel only. Hence, the figure that Mr. Roberts gave you last night amounted to pepper and dust in your eyes, with regard to the "eyes", and the "noses", and the "finger-nails", and the "breeches"; because we have given you proofs, and we could give you hundreds of proofs, that there are certain things, that is certain breeches, that only the people of Israel are to wear, and that no other people are to bedeck their bodies with. Hence we say, by virtue of our complying with those prophecies — the prophecies given to the Children of Israel — for, as we proved last night, the people of Judah were to be few in number; whereas the people of Israel were to be as the sand of the sea-shore for multitude.

In a hundred years from now — a Frenchman comes forth to give you this computation — the French people shall be 69 millions strong; the German people shall be 130 millions strong; but your nation shall be 860 millions strong in a hundred years from now; that is, if you increase according to your present ratio. Being Israel you shall, because God Almighty declares to Israel they shall, increase as they have increased: your ratio shall be kept up. Hence Judah are only to be few in number. Hence we come to the time, by virtue of being Israel, and complying with these prophecies — aye! showing the glorious distinction of Israel from Judah when God Almighty — aye, let us be reverent before Him, and let us not trifle with the deep things of God. If I have stated anything in error I ask God to forgive me, and I ask forgiveness even of my brother, Mr. Roberts. I will be faithful to God, and only to Him. But when the time shall come, after your receiving your identity, the bringing forth of the blind people, when that time shall come — what? Then the Lord shall stretch forth His hand a second time — what to do? He shall stretch forth His hand the second time to recover the outcasts of Israel, and the dispersed of Judah, and when this second-time return shall take place, then God Almighty declares that He will smite the seven streams of Egypt, and He will cause them — Israel and Judah — to go over dryshod; because it shall be like as it was to Israel in the days that they came up out of Egypt.

Hence, being identical with Israel, you only wearing the "breeches" that God intended, according to Mr. Roberts' vulgar figure — but only taking up that vulgar notion — you only wearing those "breeches", God Almighty requires you — what to do? When the time of the return shall come, which cannot be until after the receiving, that is the identity of your nation with Israel — what? Why! then you shall have another colony, and when my Lord Beaconsfield — God honour the man (applause and hisses) — the man who knows far better than the hissing of a serpent, the man who knows whose ancestry belongs to you, and who has called you many a time the historical people, the ancient people, the

traditional people, simply because he knew that your nation was connected with the people of Israel — when he went to Berlin, and when the infamous people were twitting him, and, supposing themselves wise in their own conceits, said: “What hath he done?” — why, he came to give you Cyprus, a Bible-land, and God be thanked for the gift, and why? Because you are the people of Israel, and in these latter days, which good Dr. Keith describes as “the time of the end begun”, Daniel’s “time of the end”, and I quite believe it; because in Daniel’s time of the end God requires you to return, that is to acquire another colony; what colony? Palestine, How? According as to the position of Israel in days gone by? Never: because God promised to Abraham, when the time of the return shall take place, when the perpetual possession of the land shall be, that they shall have it from the stream of Egypt to the great river — the river Euphrates. Hence it means, by virtue of your identity, when the nation shall become nationally convinced.

And there are many other things, though Mr. Roberts may laugh at them: we have Jeremiah’s vessel, with his title-deeds defined, which I assure you, and positively affirm before you, shall be found at Tara, in Ireland. Hence we say, when the ark of the covenant comes forth, when the very tables that Mr. Roberts referred to, though you will not — like geese — receive the letter now, when we unearth Tara, which shall be unearthed between this and 1882, then we shall give you the title-deeds; and that is why the Rothschilds cannot buy the Land of Palestine; because we possess the title-deeds, and it is only Israel in Christ that can claim that land, their inheritance through Christ. So we say, by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, we are going to give you another country, nay, we are going to take you back to your own land — your mother land. And are you going to return, all of you? Once more showing you the difference, when we get our title-deeds and the ark of the covenant — because God Almighty declares that He will go before you, and a great company shall return, when that holy time shall come — what? Then we shall get the land from the stream of Egypt to the great river — the river Euphrates; not a new possession, but simply a re-inhabitation of your land. And when God shall come forth, He shall come forth and substantiate His own word, by which we shall gain our missionary success in many nations, being joined to the Lord; because that dividing of the water shall be so sublime, shall so eclipse the deliverance from Egypt, that we shall forget that deliverance.

When this second-time return shall take place in conjunction with Israel and Judah, not one without the other, then we shall return a great company; but how? One of a city, and two of a family. The British people, it is impossible for you to return entire: you will only return according to the “consumption decreed” by the Almighty, determined aforetime by Him, one of a city, two of a family. But as far as Judah is concerned, not one of them shall be left behind, and they have to offer, to be accepted by God Almighty their sacrifices, by the shedding of the blood of the bull, the goat, the kid, and so forth, they have to go back and offer their sacrifices; which they could never do in England. Hence as far as they are concerned, not one of them shall be left behind, but as far as your nation is concerned, being identical with this people of Israel, and being a nation and a

company of nations, you shall only return according to the decree, aforesaid determined by God Almighty — one of a city and two of a family — a great company shall return, and after you have returned you shall not give up one of your possessions; because Obadiah distinctly declares that Israel shall possess their possessions — that is, continue to possess all the possessions that you now hold. Hence we thank God that by wearing these “breeches” you have before you the grand glory of being the people of God Almighty, to go forth and occupy your inheritance.

And why? for your own glory? that you stupid people may become glorified before God Almighty? Nothing of the kind: it is “that I, even I, may be glorified.” Hence, if you are honest, and your soul goes forth with the wish that you could glorify Jehovah, add to His praise, we say you never could glorify Him until the time of the return takes place, when many people and strong nations shall go to Jerusalem to seek the Lord and to praise His name. So we leave you with this, only this one word. You being the people of Israel, you are not a Christian people unless you want that holiday time to come when Jerusalem shall be made a praise in the earth, and Jerusalem never can be made a praise in the earth until Israel and Judah have returned. Hence you are commanded by God Almighty to seek the return of Israel and Judah, because you are to give Him no rest — it is not your option, it is not your will or fancy: it is your command from God Almighty — give Him no rest, be importunate, earnestly plead before Him, give Him no rest until He establish Jerusalem a praise in the earth, which only your identity can do.

MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH.

Mr. ROBERTS:—I exceedingly regret, dear friends, that the limits of this discussion do not allow of the full canvass of all the matters that stand related to the issue raised by Mr. Hine. I can only console myself with this thought, that as this discussion is being reported, and will be published, I shall have the opportunity, in an appendix, of treating separately the matters that have not been brought under review on this side of the platform during the course of the discussion; and I would also like to say in this connection that if any lady or gentleman has any point or passage, or difficulty, or argument, as bearing in favour of Mr. Hine's contention, and against the position which I have sought to maintain, if they will communicate it to me, I will separately treat their communication in the appendix which will be added to the published discussion. I say that, because I am aware of several who are desirous only to know the truth, and who have before their minds certain matters which have not been considered, and, in order to give them the opportunity I refer to, it is needful to be so personal as to tell them my address, which they may now take down — the Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham. Any communication to the effect I have described, sent to that address, will be registered in the appendix to the discussion, and the particular difficulty raised considered and treated.

Having said that much, I must now endeavour to make the very best use of the ten minutes or so that remain at my disposal. I think I cannot make a better use of them than by calling attention to one or two palpable features in the predictions concerning the futurity of Israel which, of their own force, are sufficient to entirely upset Mr. Hine's theory. The first point I refer to is this, that in the predictions of Israel's coming restoration, the lands from which they are to be restored are uniformly described as the land of their enemies, and if that be the case, obviously the English cannot be the ten tribes, because we are not in the land of our enemies, but in our own land. Let me read one or two illustrations of what I assert, for I never feel content to leave anything in an unestablished or doubtful form; I like to give my authority, because, of course, I know nothing of this matter except what is testified in profane and sacred records, and I am quite sure that Mr. Hine is in the same position, except perhaps — begging his pardon for the remark — that he does not quite know all that is contained in these authorities, judging from the things he has said in the course of his argument.

In Leviticus 26:44, referring to that futurity, we read, "And yet for all that, when they be *in the land of their enemies*, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them." You will find the reason of the declaration in the 32nd of Deuteronomy, the memorial song which was to embody God's protest during all the centuries against Israel's wickedness. You will find in the 26th verse of that chapter this declaration: "I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men, *were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy, lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our hand is high and the Lord hath not done all this.*" In Ezekiel 39:27: "When I have brought them again from the people, and gathered them out of *their enemies' lands*, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations; then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen." In Jeremiah 5:19: "It shall come to pass, when ye shall say, Wherefore doeth the Lord our God all these things unto us? then shalt thou answer them, Like as ye have forsaken Me, and served strange gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers *in a land that is not yours.*" In Jeremiah 30:10: "Fear thou not, O My servant Jacob, saith the Lord, neither be dismayed, O Israel, for lo, I will save them from afar, and thy seed from *the land of their captivity.*"

Then I call your attention to a class of testimonies which declare that Israel is in captivity when the crisis of restoration arrives, viz., Ezekiel 34:11-16: "I will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out My sheep, and will deliver them *out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day.* And I will bring them *out from the people*, and gather them *from the countries*, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I

will feed them in a good pasture, *and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be*: there shall they lie in a good fold, and in a fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountains of Israel. I will feed My flock, and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God. I will seek *that which was lost*, and bring again *that which was driven away*, and will bind up *that which was broken*, and will strengthen that which was sick." Are we broken? Are we sick? Are we driven away? Is it not Mr. Hine's argument that we are a consolidated and powerful nation? In Ezekiel 36:8-28; I will not read all, but a specimen or two: "I will multiply men" — this is an address to the mountains of Israel, the Land of Palestine, as you may see by the 8th verse: "Ye, O mountains of Israel, ye shall shoot forth your branches, and yield your fruit to my people of Israel; for they are *at hand to come*. For behold, I am for you, and I will turn unto you, and ye shall be tilled and sown: and I will multiply men upon you, all the House of Israel, even all of it: * * * and they shall increase and bring fruit: and I will *settle you after your old estates*, and WILL DO BETTER UNTO YOU THAN AT YOUR BEGINNINGS" — a prophecy which Mr. Hine quotes as illustrating British history. (Mr. Hine: No, he never does.)

He does in his published works: whereas you see it applies to what God is to do for Israel when Israel are brought again to their land; (verse 17): "When the house of Israel dwelt in their own land, they defiled it by their own way and by their doings: * * * wherefore I poured my fury upon them for the blood that they had shed upon the land, and for their idols wherewith they had polluted it; and I *scattered them among the heathen*, and they were *dispersed through the countries*: according to their way and according to their doings I judged them; (verse 24): "I will take you from among the heathen, and *gather you out of all countries*, and will *bring you into your own land*. THEN will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh", when He takes them back to their land — a prophecy which Mr. Hine applies to the state of things subsisting in the British nation—

Mr. HINE:—I do not: I declare I do not; I defy Mr. Roberts to show that.

Mr. ROBERTS:—I could show it from Mr. Hine's published works: but of course he is at liberty to disclaim so absurd an application.

Then, in Ezekiel 37:11: "Son of Man, these bones (symbolic bones the prophet had seen in vision), are the whole house of Israel", and that it includes the two families you will see by the subsequent part of the prophecy, where the prophet is told to take two sticks, and to unite them together, "and they shall become one in thine hand" (verse 17), and the prophet is directed that when he is asked the meaning he is to say this, (verse 21): "Say unto them, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will take *the Children of Israel* from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will *make them* ONE NATION in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all, and *they shall be no more two nations*, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

I have a great deal besides that I could read. This description of testimony — this kind of prophecy, of itself, would be entirely sufficient, in true process of logic, to destroy a theory that seeks to identify the lost ten tribes of Israel with one of the greatest and most powerful nations of the world, situated in the British islands at the present time.

I could say much more, but I forbear. I have not been able to go into all the little points and quibbles by which Mr. Hine seeks to evade the evidence that destroys his most extraordinary theory. I must be content to say that it is a theory that is most mischievous in its tendencies. It appears to me that there is no more egregious piece of theological quackery to be found under the sun at the present time than a theory which would divert the purposes of God from His own scattered and down-trodden nation, and associate them with one of the proudest and most God-disregarding nations of the earth. (Cries of "Time".)

I have the permission of the chair to occupy just one or two minutes over the time in concluding. I merely wish to say that if I did not entertain those opinions which I think I am justified in expressing because I entertain them, I would not stand upon this platform in the capacity in which I have appeared before you for the last three nights. England has a position in the prophetic scheme; she has a mission in the latter days; she has a place in those operations by which God will bring together His scattered nation in the latter days; but she is herself a thoroughly Gentile nation, destined only to play a subordinate part in the work of God with scattered Israel.

If you will come to Myddelton Hall, Islington, on Sunday evening next, at seven o'clock, I will then take the pleasure of availing myself of the opportunity of submitting to you something on this subject — not my opinions, not my assertions, but the Scriptural evidence, which goes to show that we are close upon the crisis of Israel's deliverance, and that England is verging towards the position in which she will exercise the latter-day mission which God has given her. (A voice: Time, time.)

Well, as I do not wish to inflict my words upon the patience of any gentleman, I will conclude by simply saying that the mischievousness of this theory, as it appears to me, consists of two things — one, the lesser of the two, and that one I will mention first — is that, first, it gives to England an unnatural and unscriptural complacency in regard to the position she occupies in the world in relation to God; and the second and most serious, as has been illustrated in Mr. Hine's remarks, is that it entirely diverts the attention of those who receive his theory from the only way of salvation which Christ proclaimed to men.

A GENTLEMAN ON THE PLATFORM: Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask Mr. Roberts. He is having this discussion reported, and will, of course, correct all the reporter's errors in his speeches: will he give Mr. Hine the opportunity of doing the same thing?

Mr. ROBERTS: In answer to that, I have simply to say that Mr. Hine has been offered the opportunity of revising his speeches, but he declines to avail himself of it, saying he has confidence in Mr. Roberts' friends, and that he will be too busy to go over his speeches. (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear.) If, however, Mr. Hine would like to go over the manuscript, the offer is still open to him. (Applause.)

After a vote of thanks to Mr. Hine and Mr. Roberts, and also to the Chairman, the meeting broke up.

THE TRUE POSITION OF BRITAIN IN PROPHECY.

A LECTURE BY MR. ROBERTS,

DELIVERED IN

MYDDELTON HALL, ISLINGTON, LONDON,

ON SUNDAY EVENING, APRIL 27th, 1879.

SUBJECT: *“The true position of Britain in relation to Israel’s coming Restoration, and the re-establishment of the Kingdom of David, in the hands of Christ, the Son of David (as well as the Son of God), in ascendancy over all nations for their blessedness and well-being.*”

It is one of the redeeming features of the agitation promoted by Mr. Hine — with whatever object — that it brings into controversy Bible revelation concerning God’s purpose with the House of Israel. That purpose is very much more important than it will appear to the majority of people at first sight. It will be found to involve all that is of possible interest to mankind, whether we consider their national or their individual weal.

That remark assumes what must be assumed upon the present occasion — an assumption, however, which can be established upon the very strongest evidence

— that the Bible is God's Word. I do believe that with all my heart and soul. If I did not believe it I would not be here, and I believe it in spite of science; I believe it not in ignorance of science, but in full view of all the facts, and the hypotheses founded upon the facts, which would seek to displace that marvellous Book from our confidence as the revelation of God's mind to man. It is a very tempting theme: I require to put a restraint on myself not to pursue it, and having said that much upon it, must needs now return to the particular subject that is doubtless before the minds of all who are here present.

Mr. Hine has said a great deal about England; it has been my duty during the past week to deny what he has said about it. But there is something to be said about England: she has an indirect and transient part in the programme of God's work upon earth. It would be a marvel if it were not so, considering the time in which we live, and considering the extraordinary position of the British power in the earth. But we must use our judgment scientifically in the matter. I use that word in its correct sense, not in its conventional sense: I mean that we must apply our minds clearly, accurately, logically, dispassionately to the consideration of the facts and testimonies that bear upon the subject, and not run after a theory which may be attractive because of the particular form it may assume, and then go industriously to work and seek some kind of support for it by fair means or foul.

Now, to make manifest the position which England occupies in the Divine programme of the latter days, it will be needful first to say something about the people concerning whom the whole discussion is conducted; I mean not the people of England: concerning the ancient people, concerning the scattered people, concerning the circumcised people, concerning God's chosen people, concerning the Hebrew, the Israelitish people, the descendants of the nation whom Moses brought from Egypt, and which nation was afterwards settled in a land of God's own choosing, and which has been specifically the subject of Divine manipulation in all its national destinies and experiences.

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL — MOSES' WARNING.

We have seen, during the course of the discussion, that their present position is one of down-treading, one of adversity, one of dispersion. Let me illustrate, in the light of what Moses said to them, what their present position is. When he brought them out of Egypt, when he had them assembled in the Wilderness, in the rehearsal, the magnificent rehearsal contained in the Book of Deuteronomy, of all God's dealings with them, you find him saying (Deut. 11:26): "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; A BLESSING, *if ye obey* the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and A CURSE, *if ye will not obey* the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known." Now we know which selection, as a matter of fact, the people made between those two alternatives: we know they were disobedient in

their entire history, even immediately after the death of Joshua, who brought them victoriously into the land of Canaan. We read that when Joshua was dead, and all the elders that outlived Joshua, they turned aside to the worship of the idols of the nations. God raised them up adversaries in consequence, and brought them into evil circumstances, upon which they returned unto Him, and He was besought of them, and He raised them up deliverance, and granted them a season of rest — eighty years of national prosperity — when again they declined from His way, and were again brought into adversity — a process repeated many a time with many varying circumstances, all detailed minutely, yet briefly, graphically, without circumlocution, without any adventitiousness of discourse, totally unlike any human narrative: we have it all in these wonderful books, which come to us with the stamp of Christ's endorsement.

Over a thousand years that experience was illustrated in their case, till finally first one half, namely, the half consisting of the ten tribes, and then the other half of the nation were entirely driven from the country, and brought into a position of great affliction, to which Moses made prospective allusion in a beautiful discourse which you will find in the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, from which I will read one extract. Addressing them at the end of their forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, and just prior to their crossing the Jordan and entering the land, he said, at the 22nd verse: "I must die in this land, I must not go over Jordan: but ye shall go over and possess that good land. Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which He made with you, and make you a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee. For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God. When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image: * * * I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen" — addressing the twelve tribes — "few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you. And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell."

As Moses forecast, so it came to pass; and here we are this day, witnesses of the fulfilment of His word, for the Jewish race is a fact — not a political corporation, but a nation notwithstanding — a scattered nation, a nation of one blood, of one faith, of one history, and of one mighty prospect: as we shall see, a prospect to which the large part of the nation still adhere, though in a kind of despairing hope. A day will come when the Lord God of their fathers will remember the covenant He made with them, and will gather them from their dispersion, and bring them again to their land, and use them in that mighty purpose of blessing all mankind, which He declared to Abraham, their progenitor, in the first instance, to be the

very purpose of his call, saying unto him, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed", "and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. 12:3).

CHRIST FORETELLS THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.

To bring this matter quite home to our own day and to our own experience, I call your attention to a prophecy delivered by Christ Himself in connection with the last episode in the national history, which you will find in the 21st chapter of Luke. In the 5th verse we read: "Some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts." No wonder! It was a magnificent structure, built of great blocks of marble, ornamented with spikes of gold. The whole of the description is contained in the works of Josephus, and the works of Josephus have been verified by the things discovered by the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Society. And the disciples called attention to the magnificence of the building, and said, as recorded by another Evangelist, "See what manner of stones and what buildings are here." Jesus said, "As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And they asked Him, saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?" He proceeds to answer that question: He proceeds to depict to them the course of events in their own generation immediately succeeding the time of His discourse. He describes a time of great public calamity, great social convulsions, great trouble amongst the people, great distress in the land; and winds up by saying (verse 22): "These be the days of vengeance"; (verse 23): "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people", that is, the people of the Jews, and the land of Judah, in which He was living at the time He spoke these words. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Now please go back:—let us pull ourselves back as by a chain along the waters to that time. It is only 1,800 years ago. People may say "Only!" Well, that is, perhaps, because their minds are cooped up within the four walls of their own particular little life, and engrossed with their own little concerns, which will disappear as entirely from the universe within fifty years as the snow of winter. If they will open their minds and look at facts — look at the great movements of the universe — conceive the endless ages before and behind — realise the progress of events described in the Scriptures, they will not object to this way of putting it, when I say "only 1,800 years ago since Christ was there uttering words" which are fulfilled before us this day.

JOSEPHUS' TESTIMONY.

Were they fulfilled? Yes: He says, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh;" "This generation shall not

pass away till all be fulfilled" (verses 20, 32). So that He led them to expect, within their own lifetime, the destruction of their temple, the disruption of the Jewish Commonwealth, and the dispersion of the Jewish nation. And it all happened. The works of Josephus are a sort of literary monument to the fact of Christ's words having been fulfilled. That book is a literary marvel. It is a very voluminous work; it is a very minutely-written work; it is a very clearly and accurately-expressed work, and nobody has the hardihood to suggest that it was not written in the first century, and that it was not written by Josephus — not even Mr. Bradlaugh: he was about to admit, for I had — shall I say the pleasure? I don't know; I have had the experience, at all events, of meeting him in six nights' discussion; and he does not dare to impugn the authenticity and historical veracity of the works of Josephus. And there we have it, a full account, written by Josephus from the Roman camp, for he was taken prisoner during the early part of the war, and was with Titus throughout the closing part of the campaign, a witness of all that took place, and a participator in the events which terminated in the destruction of the nation. In this position, with these opportunities, he wrote as full an account as the *Times* correspondent would write in our day of all the incidents that transpired from day to day during the accomplishment of these terrible events: till the day that Jerusalem was laid in ashes, and an unprecedented destruction of the Jewish people accomplished; for about a million of them perished in the terrible events that soaked the soil of Judah in blood from north to south, during the terrible, the frenzied resistance of the Jews to the formidable efforts of the Romans. "They shall be led away captive into all nations," said Jesus; "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until*": "UNTIL". Does not that show that Jesus recognised a limit to the desolation? Does it not show that He recognised a change coming by-and-bye in connection with Jerusalem? "*Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*" And the Jews have been scattered from that day to this, and Jerusalem has been down-trodden from that day to this, and the times of the Gentiles, chronologically and prophetically considered, have been current from that day to this, though they are running out in our age, in our generation. "Trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." What then? Well, as to what is to happen then, let me call your attention to a slight forecast of the matter by Moses himself, in the beautiful words to be found in Deuteronomy 30:1-5.

Now just realise that these words were spoken three thousand years ago. There is no doubt about that. But it is necessary to ask people to remember it, and to rouse themselves up, for they seem to be all asleep and dead about these great things; they seem to have been brought into a lethargic and unbelieving state of mind, notwithstanding that the facts of the case stand right up at every man's door, so to speak, challenging his reasonable attention. Josephus, for instance, as a book, is known to everybody of the most ordinary acquaintance with literature. This takes you back into the presence of these facts at one huge stride; for he tells you, writing 1,800 years ago, of Moses' writings having been in existence centuries

and centuries before his time. He had occasion to argue this point indirectly against Apion, an adversary of the Jews, who sought to bring scorn upon them by making out that the Jews and their literature were of very recent and infamous origin. Josephus answers his arguments, and makes manifest the great antiquity of the nation of the Jews and the Mosaic writings. He does this most successfully and trenchantly, quoting Egyptian, Greek and Babylonian authors, whose very existence would in our day have been unknown but for Josephus' quotation of them.

MOSES FORETELLS RESTORATION.

Realise, therefore, that we are now reading what was written three thousand years ago. This is a general forecast of God's purpose to restore Israel after the punishment of their sins. "It shall come to pass", says Moses, "when all these things are come upon thee",—still addressing the congregation of the twelve tribes,—"the blessing and the curse," for they first had the blessing and then the curse, "which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee", or shall have driven thee, "and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey His voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; that then the Lord thy God will *turn thy captivity*, and have compassion upon thee, and will *return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee*. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee; and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and He will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers." Why! there is a forecast by Moses three thousand years ago, of restoration as the finality of God's dealings with the House of Israel.

THE PROPHETS ON THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

Now let us take something more recent, and something which may be more precise, and in some respects may be considered more satisfactory, because people might feel concerning these general indications by Moses, that perhaps they had their fulfilment in the return of Israel from Babylon, and I say, to shut the door against any idea of that sort, let us look at other descriptions which entirely preclude the possibility of any such suggestion being admitted. Let us take this in Jeremiah 30:10: "Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid." Verse 18: "Thus saith the Lord; Behold, I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling-places; and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall

remain after the manner thereof. And out of them shall proceed thanksgiving and the voice of them that make merry: and I will multiply them, and they shall not be few; I will also glorify them, and they shall not be small. Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before Me, and I will punish all that oppress them. And *their nobles* shall be of themselves, and THEIR GOVERNOR shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto Me: for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto Me?"

Who is that? Now we can settle that in a very quick and straight manner: look first at Micah 5:2: "Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel", — *Ruler in Israel* — "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Who is that? Look at the 2nd chapter of Matthew: "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the King, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" and it goes on to tell us that Herod, being troubled, convened the chief priests and scribes, and demanded of them where Christ should be born "They said unto him, in Bethlehem of Judea: for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule My people Israel." Here is proof of the applicability of this prophecy to the Messiah. Who came out of Bethlehem? Jesus of Nazareth: here is the Governor that came out from amongst themselves, and has been caused to approach to the presence — to the ineffable presence of the eternal and self-existing Creator of heaven and earth. And what about his governing of Israel?

Now let us go back to the prophets, and see whether this picture has ever been realised. Jeremiah 33:14, 15: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the House of Israel and to the House of Judah. In those days and at that time will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; *and he shall execute judgment and righteousness* IN THE LAND. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely." Or take it as you find it in Jeremiah 23:5-8: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord"; the words are almost the same, but there are certain words that come after, that are an addition: "that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall *execute judgment and justice* IN THE EARTH. In his days *Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely*; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt"; because that ancient deliverance will be so entirely eclipsed by the one to be accomplished by the Son of David,— "But, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led the seed of the House of Israel out of *the north country*,

and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land."

Now nobody can suggest that that is Babylon: the door is shut against all idea of that sort. It is a futurity with which Christ is associated as a reigning king, and when under Him, Israel and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; it is the thing referred to by Christ in the word *until*: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*."

THE APOSTLES ON THE RESTORATION.

Take Peter's allusion to all these glorious predictions. I am sorry there is not time to read more. I have a great many of them. Why! Those who know the Scriptures are well aware that the prophetic Scriptures are brimming with declarations concerning the re-organisation of the Kingdom of Israel under the great Son of David, in whom, as we shall presently see, all families of the earth shall be blessed. Let your minds rest upon the words I am going to read, for Scripture is not a mere jargon of pious phraseology, like the Church Service: it is a clear enunciation of sound ideas, the mind of God expressed under the guidance of the Spirit of God by the servants of God, prophets and apostles, who were totally unlike the religious leaders of the present order of things.

In Acts 3:19, "Repent ye", says Peter, — and, in order to comprehend the full force of his words, recollect where he was speaking: he was speaking in Jerusalem; he was speaking in the court of the temple to a large Jewish crowd, drawn together by the performance of the miracle of causing the lame man to walk with a word: he was addressing the crowd who had clamoured for the destruction of Him whom Pilate nailed to the cross under the superscription, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews"; they were convinced by the manifestation of Divine power through Peter and the other apostles that this Jesus of Nazareth, whom they had put to death, was really their Messiah; and Peter said, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and *He shall send Jesus Christ*, which before was preached unto you: whom *the heaven must receive UNTIL*" — until when? "*until the times of restitution of all things, WHICH GOD HATH SPOKEN BY THE MOUTH OF ALL HIS HOLY PROPHETS SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN.*" Verse 24: "*All the prophets* from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, *have likewise foretold of these days.*" The heavens must hold Him until the time spoken of by the prophets. And then shall He come? Yes.

For so it is written over and over again. For instance, in Acts 1:11: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.*" What is He coming for? 2 Tim. 4:1: "Jesus Christ who shall judge the living and the dead at His appearing *and His kingdom.*" Is He coming to reign? Why! you could not make anything else out of those things I have read from the

prophets, if there were no other information at all; but when we come to the specific delineation in the New Testament of the things that are to transpire when He comes, they are all focalised, so to speak, in one declaration: "*The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever*" (Rev. 11:15).

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF CHRIST.

Has He anything to do with the restoration of the Jews? Why! He could not set up His kingdom without that. Why not? Why! What is His kingdom? What kingdom is His kingdom? Is it the kingdom of Great Britain? is it the kingdom of Austro-Hungary? Is it the empire of Russia? Look at the 1st chapter of Luke, verse 32: "He shall be great" — an angel is the speaker: he is speaking to Mary, the mother of Christ, before Christ was born: "He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him *the throne of His father David*: and He shall *reign over the House of Jacob* for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end." Look at those glorious words that are made familiar year by year to the mind of the public by the music of Handel: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and *the government shall be upon His shoulder*: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, *UPON THE THRONE OF DAVID, and upon His kingdom*, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. *The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this*" (Isaiah 9:6, 7).

It will not be done by human agency. "I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down" (Acts 15:16). How can that be done without gathering the people of Israel? Well, but we will not rest content with a mere inference: let us take the express declaration of the prophet that a part of Christ's work is the re-gathering of the House of Israel. In Isaiah 49:5: "And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be His servant, to bring Jacob again to Him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength." That is Christ's present position; Israel is not gathered, but He is glorious in the presence of the Lord God of Israel, whose manifestation He is by conception and by anointing with the Holy Spirit at His baptism in the Jordan. When on earth, His work was an apparent failure. He is tempted to say, as at the 4th verse of this 49th chapter of Isaiah: "I have laboured in vain, I have spent My strength for nought, and in vain; yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and My work with My God." His life appeared to be a failure: "He came to His own, and His own received Him not"; but here is a prophetic forecast that although His work in the first instance should be an apparent failure, He Himself personally should be no sufferer: He was to be taken away to the right hand of power; and He says here, "Though Israel be not

gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of Jehovah", and then Jehovah proceeds to say, "It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be My Servant *to raise up the tribes of Jacob*, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will *also* give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth," — showing that an extension of His mission would take place.

He would offer blessing to the Gentiles as well as to Israel. But you see the first and proximate element in His work was the *raising up of the tribes of Israel*: therefore so long as the Jewish nationality is scattered to the winds, as it is at the present day, and the Land of Promise in desolation — yea, so long, I may say, as the earth is ruled by man, Christ's work is not accomplished. It is in process of accomplishment: He laid the finished foundation of it at His first appearing, but its full development is a matter of futurity, as is evident from these few testimonies, and as will become further evident as we proceed.

I would like to read some more statements about the Jews returning, but I think I will not, because of the other things that have to come. Let me just read one more specimen, though I think it is not necessary. It seems to me that I could not read anything more forcible than those I have quoted, but just let me read one which those acquainted with the Scriptures are well aware is but a specimen of a great many. I will read from the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, at the 21st verse: "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will take the Children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." That has never happened; no one can suggest a past fulfilment to this, and unless you are prepared to say the Word of God is a lie, or a delusion, or an imposture, or something of that sort, you are bound to say it will happen in the days that are to come. Look at the 11th chapter of Isaiah: "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea"; so it says in the 9th verse. I think everybody will say that is not yet fulfilled. Very well; then this occurs in connection with that, at verse 12: "And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall *assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.*"

OBJECTIONS: "UNBELIEVING JEWS."

Just one or two answers to objections here. It may be said, "Well, certainly it appears obvious that a restoration is predicted there, a gathering together of this outcast nation"; but, "We cannot see into it, because these Jews, whether they call them Israel or Jews, they are disobedient; they are unbelieving; they are not in the condition referred to by Moses — as a condition of blessing: for what purpose, or with what fitness or suitability, can they be gathered? With what object? Surely if they are a bad people in dispersion, they would be a worse people in

consolidation.” People might argue in that way. Therefore let me read one or two of God’s explanations of the reasons He has before His mind when He sets His hand again a second time, as He declares by Isaiah He will, to bring them together from their wide-spread dispersion. Now you cannot find anything more perfectly simple and satisfactory on this point than Ezekiel 36:16:

“NOT FOR YOUR SAKES.”

“Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, when the House of Israel dwelt in their own land, they defiled it by their own way and by their doings: * * * And I scattered them among the heathen, and they were dispersed through the countries: according to their way, and according to their doings, I judged them. And when they entered unto the heathen, whither they went, they profaned My holy name, when they said to them, These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of His land. But *I had pity for mine holy name*, which the House of Israel had profaned among the heathen, whither they went. Therefore say unto the House of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, *I do not this for your sakes*, O House of Israel, but FOR MINE HOLY NAME’S SAKE, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went. *And I will sanctify My great name*, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.” The object of their restoration is the vindication of the honour of God, by the manifestation of His power, that men in all the earth may see and know that He is God and submit to what He will require of them in the law that will go forth from Zion.

PURGING OUT THE REBELS.

Are Israel to be restored in a bad state? No. Are they to be gathered in a good state? No. What is the meaning of that — an apparent contradiction? You will find the explanation, if you listen to this from Ezekiel 20:34: “And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched-out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of the Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: and I will *purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against Me*: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel.” So they are all to be brought, as Moses says, wherever there is one of them anywhere, good, bad, or indifferent; all to be gathered until they undergo a purification, before their entering into the land, as

their fathers did when they came out of Egypt: there is to be an entire purgation, and only a purified residue will enter into the land to take part in that re-organization that is to take place when Moses' words are fulfilled, as quoted from Deuteronomy 18, in Acts 3:22, 23.

“A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; *him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you*: And it shall come to pass that every soul who will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.” That has not been fulfilled yet, but it will be. Christ has not left the earth for ever. He has blessed it already with His presence for a short time, and the glory of that presence, though in weakness, was so great, that faintly — though faintly — it has illuminated the Gentile darkness during all these dreary ages that have since elapsed. But He is coming back to shine with a greater glory. He is to rise as the Sun of Righteousness, before whose presence every form of evil amongst mankind will disappear: because in His hands there will be irresistible power, which no power of armies or strength of ironclads will be able to resist; and infallible wisdom to direct the affairs of the whole family of man throughout the world, through the administration of His tried and proved and then glorified friends, whom He is to bring from the grave and associate with Himself in the magnificent and glorious work of administering human affairs with true delight to all mankind, and with that “Glory to God in the highest” which was proclaimed by the angels as the necessary antecedent of true human blessedness.

“THE LATTER DAYS” — ENGLAND'S POSITION.

And now the question is: What has England to do with this? Well, before I ask that, perhaps another question ought to be asked, and briefly answered, and that is: What evidence have we that the ingathering of this despised people, the re-organisation of this broken nationality, is an event near to us? what evidence have we that it is going to happen by-and-bye? I will briefly direct your attention to the evidence. It must be very briefly. Allow me to say that it could be done extensively, because there is a great deal of evidence and argument upon the point, but the time now only admits of a little of it.

First, we have this information, that it is “*in the latter days*” when this great change in the fortunes of the House of Israel is to take place. We have that information in a variety of ways. I will give but two specimens. In Hosea 3:4, 5: “The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice. * * * Afterward shall the children of Israel return, * * * and shall fear the Lord and His goodness *in the latter days*.” Then we have an account of the shape of the final conflict between God and Gentile power that characterises the arrival of the time of restoration, and immediately precedes the full accomplishment of the work. Concerning that, we read in Ezekiel 38:8: “*After many days* thou — thou” — a certain potentate addressed in the 1st and

2nd verses, who, I may say, can be identified with the Emperor of Russia — “After many days thou shalt be visited: *in the latter years* thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword.” How many days? Let me direct you to the answer on that point in the 8th chapter of Daniel — and I would say to every true disciple of Christ that he or she is at home in Daniel, if he or she be a true disciple of Christ. How is that? Because Christ referred to the prophet Daniel as an authority to be respected. He said, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law and *the prophets*: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil”: and He says, “When ye shall see the abomination of desolation *spoken of by Daniel the prophet*” (Matt. 24:15). I make that remark because my experience generally is that as soon as you speak of the prophet Daniel in the presence of religious people, there is a shrug of the shoulder, as if that was something altogether out of the province of reason, and indeed something dangerous to be considered. Let them ask themselves on what ground they entertain that feeling; and if they look at the matter rightly, they will not only find that there is no reason for such a feeling, but they will turn to Daniel with thankful reverence, and find light on the dark part of human history, which, though dark now, has a glorious ending anon.

In Daniel 8:26, we find the angel telling Daniel: “The vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for *it shall be for MANY DAYS*.” How many? Look at the 14th verse: “He said unto me” — in answer to the question, *How long* shall be the vision? — “*unto 2,300 days*.” Has that any meaning? You may say, “Perhaps it has; but how are we to know?” Let me observe, we can know. You may say, “In what way?” There is a straight and short road to the understanding of it. We have a key to this in the case of another prophet, Ezekiel, who was put through certain symbolic operations with reference to the past and coming history of the house of Israel. He was told to lie upon his side a certain number of days to represent the house of Israel in a certain relation, and he is told about that in Ezek. 4:5: “I have laid upon thee *the years* of their iniquity, *according to the number of the days*”; and at verse 6: “I have appointed thee EACH DAY FOR A YEAR.” When we come to Daniel we find that the same principle obtains, because there is in Daniel a prophecy concerning the crucifixion of Christ, fixing it to happen in 490 days from the issue of a certain edict of the Persian Emperor; and it was because that period reckoned in years was about to expire in the days of Christ that there was a general expectancy amongst the Jews everywhere that the Messiah would appear; and He did appear at the time, though they did not recognise Him in the particular character in which He presented Himself. Therefore we have a key to the meaning of “days”.

How long is it since that vision began that Daniel saw? If you will examine the vision, you will find it is a symbolical representation of events that began with the uprising of the Empire of Persia. There is no mist about it; there is nothing obscure or fanatical about this. People think these things are inscrutable. Look at the 3rd verse: “Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns.” People laugh at the ram with two horns. Why

do they not laugh at the British lion? Is the British nation the only nation that uses an animal to represent its power? No: Persia used a ram, and Greece used a goat. Accordingly we read in verse 20: "The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia: and the rough goat is the king of Grecia, and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king". The thing is palpable: we are dealing with facts; we are looking at something substantial. It is no dreamy business. We know how long it is since Persia became a power in the world: it is all the time mentioned in that verse, and more — "2,300 days"; — what then? — "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed". The expiry of that period introduces us to the era of Jewish restoration.

THE RESURRECTION "AT THE END OF THE DAYS."

I could give a good deal more evidence to show that we are in "the time of the end" — the end of the days. You may say, "How are we to be sure that the time of the end is the end of the days?" Look at Daniel 12:13: "Go thou thy way till *the end* be: for thou (Daniel) shalt rest, and stand in thy lot *at the end of the days.*" Thou, Daniel, shalt rest — does it say, "rest in heaven? thou shalt go to realms above the skies?" No; that is an invention; that is not a Scriptural doctrine. The Scriptural doctrine is in harmony with what science finds. We are mortal: when we are dead we are dead; and if God never brought us to life again, we should never appear in the universe at all again; but, thanks be to God! He has shed light in on human futurity, through Christ. He has given us in Him "the Resurrection and the Life." He has given to Him the power to bring forth the friends of God at the appointed time; to bring them into relation with a blessed state of things upon earth, to be established by Him at his coming, not up in the clouds. "Go thy way, Daniel; thou shalt rest." Ah, but you see it says "rest". Aye, rest; but where? Look at the 2nd verse: "Many of them that sleep (or rest) *in the dust of the earth* shall awake." "Go thou thy way (Daniel) till the end be, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot *at the end of the days.*" It is perfectly plain. People do not understand because they do not study; and they do not study, because, in the first place, they are not interested: they are taken up altogether with this world's affairs; and, in the second place, because if they are religious, under the guidance of their religious leaders, their hopes and aspirations are all fixed on the day of their death, when they hope to go beyond the stars. They have no interest in the purposes of God on earth. Their false doctrine of natural immortality, borrowed from the Greek pagans, has made void the Word of God which we have in our hands.

"THE SHIPS OF TARSHISH."

A good many other arguments might be employed to show that we are now in the latter days; but I must hurry on. I must now ask: As it is in the latter days that Israel's regeneration is to be accomplished, what has England to do with it? The answer to that is to be found in this fact, that when the time for restoration

arrives, we find there is a certain power in the earth providentially made use of to co-operate in the work. I will read the passages to which I refer, and then I will ask you to perceive, in the considerations I will suggest, their applicability to the nation of which we form a part. Let us turn to Isaiah 60. In the last verse but one of the previous chapter we read: "The Redeemer shall come to Zion", and I may say that, in the 11th chapter of Romans, Paul quotes that as a prophecy unfulfilled in his day, which shows it cannot apply to the first coming of Christ, and must therefore apply to the second. "The Redeemer shall come." Following upon that there is this most glorious address to the House of Israel (60:1): "Arise, thine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. * * * And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising"; and it goes on to say in the 8th verse: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows? Surely THE ISLES shall wait for me, and *the ships of Tarshish* first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because He hath glorified thee."

In Isaiah 18:1 we read: "Woe" — or, more correctly, "*Ho!* to the land shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia: that sendeth ambassadors by the sea, even in vessels of" — *bulrushes* we have here, but that is palpably a mistake, for vessels of bulrushes sent upon the mighty ocean would not long be vessels of any sort. What should it be? There are Hebraists who agree in saying that it means vessels with moving things, turning things — pointing to a peculiar form of vessels that should be used in the latter days: "Vessels of moving, turning, whirling things, upon the waters, saying, Go, ye swift messengers", — no ships were *swift messengers* until the steam marine of Great Britain came into existence — "to a nation scattered and peeled, to a people terrible from their beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden down, whose land the rivers have spoiled! All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth, see ye, when He lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when He bloweth a trumpet, hear ye." And then he proceeds to describe something that would be very interesting to follow, namely: the judgments that are to descend upon the ripened iniquity of the present generation. But we pass on to the 7th verse: "In that time shall the present be brought unto the Lord of Hosts of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from their beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose land the rivers have spoiled, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion."

THE "YOUNG LIONS" OF TARSHISH.

Now read Ezekiel 38:16, and this is the last one I will quote on this point, and then I will ask you to consider how they bear on the matter: "And thou shalt come up against My people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days, and I will bring thee against My land, that the heathen may know Me, when

I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes". Now observe verse 13: "Sheba, and Dedan, and *the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof*, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?"

Now here are three passages in which in the latter days, a power is represented — first, as shielding the infant colony of Israel in its beginning; and secondly, as taking part in helping a more widespread restoration afterwards; and thirdly, as bringing a present of the scattered people to God. Now the question is: What power is there in our day that can answer to the description? Well, reminding you of the reason we have for believing we are now in the latter days, let us look around, and see. First, take the SHIPS: what power is there whose characteristic description, as a characteristic applicable to herself alone, is, — "*the ships of Tarshish*". Obviously, there is but one: England is the only really maritime power. Of course there are other powers that are called maritime powers, because they have ships; but consider their proportions, — the relative proportions of the navies of the world. All the ships of all the other powers of the world put together scarcely come up to England's. That, therefore, of itself, would cause one to think surely it must be England! That would not be conclusive of itself, but it would establish a presumption.

"SHIPS", "SEA", "ISLES."

We must look at the other points. We want something more certain than that. We are not to be content, like Mr. Hine, with a mere possibility, or with a mere perhaps, a casual coincidence and faint resemblance. We want proof; and we can get it. In the next place: this power having ships, is said to "send ambassadors *by the sea*." Does not that imply that it is an island-power? France does not require to send her ambassadors by sea: she sends them by land to Vienna, to Berlin, to Madrid, to St. Petersburg; the only country where she has to use the sea is England, and she has to use English ships to do that. "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows? Surely THE ISLES shall wait for me" (Isaiah 60:8, 9). What are those? Are we not only the power having ships but isles? — the islands of Great Britain? People may say, "Why don't you allow that in Mr. Hine's argument? Does not he quote passages about isles, too?" Yes, he does; but let me read them to you. I will read to you all the passages he quotes about the isles, and you will see that while they have a bearing upon the subject I am talking about, so far from proving that the inhabitants of these "isles" are Israel, they prove that they are not Israel but adjuncts and servants of Israel, who co-operate with Israel in obeying the command of the King of Israel, when he commences His work of breaking the kingdoms of the earth as a potter's vessel.

Isaiah 41:1: "Keep silence before Me, O islands; and let the people renew their strength: let them come near, then let them speak: let us come near together to

judgment.” Isaiah 42:4: “The isles shall wait for His law.” Aye, well, England will be commanded to keep silence shortly. She makes great brag now before the nations of the earth, but she will be compelled to keep silence before the power of Christ which will be exerted with this result: “THE ISLES SHALL WAIT FOR HIS LAW;” not at once. The English people are too fond of their political privileges to give them up at once; they think they have a natural right to be a law-making people. Universal suffrage is a sacred thing with them: the right of the people by the mere vote of majorities to appoint the men who are to make the laws? What is there really sacred in this? The majority are the ignorant, the evil, the unqualified. Why should they give law to intelligence? However, we will not discuss it. That is the theory of things under the British Constitution — government by majority. There will be a change when Christ reigns. “The law shall go forth of Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Micah 4:2), and it will come forth from the Son of David. The British Parliament will be commanded to surrender allegiance to “the Lion of the Tribe of Judah”. The isles shall wait for His law.

Another passage that Mr. Hine quotes is Isaiah 42:10: “Sing unto the Lord a new song, and His praise from the end of the earth, ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein; the isles, and the inhabitants thereof.” Yes: so they will. They sing “Rule Britannia” now, but they will sing “Glory to God in the Highest, peace on earth, good will among men” by-and-bye. “There were great voices in heaven”, says John, “saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever.” That “a new song” shall be sung in these isles does not prove that Israel has anything to do with the isles, except that they are exiles in them — such of them as are here.

THE ISLES TO LISTEN AND OBEY.

Isaiah 49:1: “Listen, O isles, unto me”, a command to “the isles” to LISTEN: not a proof that they are Israel, but the opposite, for Israel were in their land when these words were uttered. Jer. 31:10: “Hear the Word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it *in the isles* afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock.” How does that prove that we are Israel? It is rather a command to do what we are doing to-night, to tell this enlightened nation — for, although it is for the most part in the dark in regard to the purposes of God, it is comparatively enlightened and the command is to declare in these islands that it is God’s purpose to gather His scattered people, one of whom is placed at the summit of British power for the purpose of developing a situation favourable to the inauguration of the work that will be commenced shortly; had Mr. Gladstone been in power, we should have had no footing in Egypt as proprietors of the Suez Canal, and no footing in Cyprus as protectors of the land which comprehends the Holy Land in which position the Russian power finds us, as described in Ezekiel, the 38th and 39th chapters.

Next, Isaiah 42:12: "Let them give glory unto the Lord and declare His praise *in the islands*." We may live to see that accomplished, when God's glory will be declared, instead of the glory of man.

And finally, Isaiah 59:18: "To the islands He will repay recompence". What sort of recompence? Well, I could show, if the time allowed of it, that the recompence we shall receive will not be flattering to us, — will not be pleasing to us, — I will indicate the nature of it by reading a single passage from Isaiah 2:12, which will speak for itself: "For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up, and he shall be brought low." At verse 10: "Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down; and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud", and at verse 16, "upon *all the ships of Tarshish*." "Thou breakest *the ships of Tarshish*," we are told in Psalm 48:7, "with an east wind." He *will* break them: for the Hebrew tense is somewhat indefinite, and flexible enough to apply to futurity where that is involved.

Mr. Hine quotes all these passages where "isles" and "islands" are mentioned, to prove that Israel is an island nation. I think you will have seen with how little reason he uses these passages in that way.

ENGLAND AND RUSSIA: ANTAGONISTIC POLICY.

Now, the question is: Are those islands the British Islands? The very form of things would show that it is so. I mean as regards the current political situation. Here are England and Russia planted face to face with each other in Asia Minor, because England has undertaken to protect the Asiatic possessions of the Sultan against Russia, so that — as *The Golos* said last week — "the next time Russia goes to war in these parts, it will not be with Turkey but with Great Britain, whom she encounters in the Asiatic part of the Sultan's dominions." This position of things existing at such a time as this would show that it must be England; the ships would show that it must be England. But there is another element in the case that is decisive, and that is the word "Tarshish". I might have said that the phrase "the islands of the sea" shows it is England, because there is no other nation that is an island nation but ourselves.

"TARSHISH."

But the next point is Tarshish. Well, how do we apply this to England? By a process of argument arising out of Ezekiel 27:12. This chapter is an address to ancient Tyre, the capital of Phoenicia, the Britain of ancient days — I mean the power that in the ancient world fulfilled the part of England in conducting the traffic of the sea and the business of the world in general. There is a description here of the various markets that were open to her, and the various countries that

traded with her, and in this passage we read: "Tarshish was thy merchant by reason of the multitude of all kinds of riches; with silver, iron, *tin*, and lead, they traded in thy fairs." Now, tin was derived from but one source in those days. The question is: What source was that? Whence was the tin derived that was supplied to the markets of Phoenicia or Tyre, and thence distributed through the world? That is a matter of historical enquiry, and I may say, without going round about, that classic investigation will show that the British Islands were the source from which Phoenician merchants brought the tin that was sold in the Tyrian market and supplied to all the military nations for the alloy in the manufacture of their military and other implements. There was no other known source of supply at the time. The Greeks tried to find out the secret in vain. Herodotus, I think it is, who speaks of the Phoenician ships being chased and rather suffering themselves to be wrecked than disclose the secret.

The very name *Britain* shows it: for you find that in Welsh the word means *the land of metals*, and that in the Phoenician, which is the source of the Welsh, for there can be no doubt that many of the names of capes, mountains, rivers, and so forth in Cornwall, Wales, etc., are Hebrew in form, because they are Syriac, which was allied to the Hebrew, and they are Syriac, because the Phoenicians from Syria were the first trading settlers in the southern parts of Britain, as the extinct mines in Cornwall bear witness to this day. I was about to say: You find the Phoenicians called these islands Baratanac, which came, in the course of ages, to be pronounced Britanic, and gradually softened down to Britain.

"The merchants of Tarshish and all the young lions thereof" were to antagonise Gog, that is Russia, in the latter days. Are we merchants? Yes, the merchant-power of the world. Do lions answer to our political heraldry? Yes; the young lions rampant are the arms of our royal house; and the great lion, the standard of our political constitution. Mr. Hine has made mistaken use of Hebrew resemblances, in the nomenclature of the country, and of the political heraldry of the nation. These matters identify the isles with Britain.

ENGLAND NOT ISRAEL, BUT ISRAEL'S SERVANT.

But there is all the difference in the world between this position and Mr. Hine's theory, that there is between master and servant. England is not Israel, but Israel's servant; she will have to bend her back to the King of Israel. Mr. Hine makes it an objection in his books that if we are not Israel, then we shall have to cringe to the Jews. Just so! But God has made choice of our nation to minister to the Jews in the great and marvellous programme that is to be developed upon the earth when Christ arrives; and this surely is a great honour.

SOLOMON A TYPE.

We may see an analogy between the state of things foreshown in the prophets, and what existed in the days of Solomon. The events in the ancient history of

Israel were analogies or foreshadowings of future things, as can be shown in many ways. Solomon, the king of Israel, had in Hiram, the king of Tyre, a maritime ally, who placed his ships at his disposal in the building of the temple and the consolidation of the kingdom of David: and England, the latter-day Tyre, with all her vessels, will be placed at the feet of the King of Israel when he arrives to re-establish David's kingdom as the governing instrument of the earth. But before that comes to pass, we have a sea of blood to wade through, just as was the case in David's reign prior to Hiram's assistance; there is to be a time of trouble such as has never been upon the face of the earth. And the source of the trouble is revealed in this, that when the Lord appears in the earth and begins His work with the House of Israel, the nations of the world resist Him. John saw it in vision (Revelation 19:19): the kings of the earth and their armies gathered to fight against Christ. The result of the war is not doubtful; He overcomes them, and in the breaking of their power inflicts that humiliation described by Isaiah, when the power and pride of man everywhere will be broken, and the lofty looks of man brought low, and the Lord alone exalted.

THE "ONE HOPE."

Now, it may be said, "What have we to do with all this?" Well, there is a very forcible answer, if there were time to show it. If we are to have any future life, if we are to have any position in the blessedness which God has prepared for His people, if we are to have a share in the salvation covenanted to Israel — *and there is no other salvation under the heavens* — we must be heirs of the kingdom that Christ is to establish at His coming. And who are the heirs? James 2:5: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?" What is faith? Hebrews 11:1: "Faith is the *substance of things hoped for*, the evidence of things not seen." What things hoped for? Any? — any things hoped for? No, no: Paul says in Ephesians 4:4: There is *one* hope. What hope is that? Speaking of salvation in Colossians 1:5, he says: "The hope which is *laid up for you in heaven*, WHEREOF YE HEARD BEFORE IN THE WORD OF THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL." People say, "Ah! there it is: laid up in *heaven*." Yes, it is laid up there, for Christ is there; but it is coming with Him, and when it comes, it will be immortality of nature and a position of power in the Kingdom of God. The first condition of attaining this is, that we must believe in the Gospel, wherein Paul says, the hope is set forth: that Gospel is the Gospel of the Kingdom of God (Acts 28:31; 19:8; 8:12; Matthew 24:14); and no person who is ignorant of the Kingdom of God that is to be established by Christ at His coming can believe the Gospel.

You may believe in the death of Christ; that is only a part of the Gospel. You will find, if you consult many parts of Scripture, two of which I will give — Acts 8:12; 28:31 — that the Gospel is made up of two things: the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ; and in view

of these things you will understand this little circumstance which Mr. Hine could not explain in answer to my question. Acts 28:17: "And it came to pass" — when Paul arrived in Rome — "that after three days, Paul called the chief of the Jews together"; and he said to them, verse 20, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain." The hope of the Gospel is the hope of Israel: the salvation that God is to reveal in the earth by Christ is a Jewish salvation; for, as He said to the Samaritan woman, "Salvation is of the Jews" (John 4:22). Have we Gentiles no hope, then? O yes. How? We who are afar off may be made nigh. By what process? Paul says that we are branches of the wild olive that may be grafted upon the good stock of Abraham, in the belief and obedience of the truth in baptism. He says: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ", and "If ye be Christ's" — and ye may become Christ's by believing the Gospel, and being baptised: there is no other way of being saved — "then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Rom. 11:17; Gal. 3:27-29).

People may laugh at it, they may think it is childish, they may think it too narrow for their enlightened liberality — people who think themselves wise and honourable in raking in the cinder-heaps of antiquarian barbarism and philology, or in the full-blown pride of the nebulous hypotheses manufactured by scientific speculation which changes form and hue every ten years — I say, such people may laugh at the simplicity of these things, and at the faith that builds on Moses, the prophets, and the apostles; but, as the proverb says, "Let those laugh who win". Where will science be, when the Lion of the Tribe of Judah sends His roars throughout the world? Where will ancient lore be, when everlasting life becomes a fact upon the earth, by the power that God has given to Christ? What is the use of a man's fame, and his titles, and his diplomas, when he is on his dying-bed? Of what use are a man's attainments when he is rotting in the cemetery? It is now, as it was in Paul's day, "God knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain."

The first Cause is greater than the phenomena on the surface: men proudly fill themselves with the phenomena; they ignore the fact that the First Cause has spoken. God demands our simple faith and obedience. But all the world has turned its gaze away: they are all following vanity — some in the shape of fleeting pleasure, some in the honours of false or superficial science, some in the gains of the present world. But Christ is coming; He will shiver the kingdoms of the world to atoms; He will abolish the entire system of human society as now constituted. He will establish new heavens and new earth, politically and socially. When the proud sons of mammon, and the science-stuffed *savants* of this God-neglecting generation, shall sleep their perpetual sleep in the grave appointed for all who wander out of the way of understanding, the Son of David will be alive upon earth with His friends of all ages who have honoured Him with faith in His promises and obedience to His commandments; and it is because that absent but coming Christ has commanded His friends to speak these things in His absence — whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear — that these things are now rehearsed in your hearing.

APPENDIX.

(Mr. Hine was offered the opportunity of writing an answer to this additional matter, for publication along with it, but did not accept the offer.)

TIME at the discussion did not allow of the full presentation of the argument in disproof of Mr. Hine's absurd and mischievous theory. Sufficient was advanced to be effective for that purpose, but some parts of the evidence call for a more complete exhibition, and some points require elucidation, and difficulties occurring to those who listened to the Debate have to be considered according to promise. For this purpose an Appendix is added. To keep it within due bounds we must be as epigrammatic and condensed as possible.

ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

The essence of the Anglo-Israel argument lies in the distinction it makes between the two political sections into which the Hebrew nation was divided in the days of Rehoboam. For the ten-tribe section it claims all blessedness on the strength of promises that speak of "Israel" (in the teeth of the fact that that section of the nation was incurably idolatrous, and that Mr. Hine was compelled to allow in cross-examination, that the term "Israel" applies equally to the two-tribe section); and to the two-tribe section it allots all, or nearly all the curses uttered by the prophets, whether addressed to Israel or Judah. The whole argument is a fundamental mistake. The whole nation of the twelve tribes was under the law of Moses, which made blessing dependent entirely on obedience to its requirements. This is plain from the book of Deuteronomy in particular. Not even Mr. Hine can dispute it. That the curses connected with the breaking of the law applied equally to all the tribes is evident, (1) from the fact that they were addressed to both; (2) from its actual application to both — (a) to the ten tribes at and in their deportation; and (b) to the two tribes a considerable time afterwards. The schism in the reign of Rehoboam made no difference in the relation of the ten tribes to the principles on which their national existence was founded in the law of Moses. That schism was itself a punishment for infraction of that law (1 Kings 11:9-13), and the total extinction of the kingdom of the ten tribes three hundred years after is expressly declared to have been for the same reason (2 Kings 17:15-18). The House of Judah remained in the land for several centuries afterwards (with the exception of a disciplinarian banishment of seventy years to

Babylon), because with Judah was found some redeeming features (2 Chron. 11:16; Hosea 11:12), and because God proposed the preservation of the line of David till it should be "established for ever" in the person of His promised Son, Jesus (Luke 1:32), to whom is promised the throne of the kingdom in the fulness of the times of restitution (Dan. 7:15; Acts 1:6; Luke 22:28; Acts 3:20, 21). The two houses, however, both proved reprobate, and were subjected to the punishment long threatened. This is effectively exhibited in the parable of the two women (Ezek. 23), of whom it is said (verse 36): "Son of man, wilt thou judge Aholah (Samaria — the capital of the ten tribes — verse 4) and Aholibah (Jerusalem — the capital of the two tribes — verse 4)? Yea, declare unto them their abominations; that they have committed adultery, and blood is in their hands. * * * They have defiled My sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned My sabbaths. * * * Thus saith the Lord God, I will bring up a company upon them, and *will give them to be REMOVED AND SPOILED*" (verses 36-46). Here both are included in the same retribution, the kingdom of the ten tribes (Samaria) and the kingdom of the two (Jerusalem). That both are meant is evident by express comparison earlier in the chapter. The ten tribes had been "removed and spoiled" when the prophet uttered the words: the two tribes were about to be so. Hence the prophet, addressing Jerusalem, says (verse 32): "Thou shalt drink of THY SISTER'S CUP deep and large: thou shalt be laughed to scorn and had in derision; it containeth much. Thou shalt be filled with drunkenness and sorrow, with the cup of astonishment and desolation, *with the cup of thy sister Samaria*" (verses 32, 33). As both are included in the same retribution — (that threatened under their national constitution in case of the disobedience of which they became guilty) — so both are included in the same restoration when the time for that arrives.

Thus in a similar parable, in another chapter (Ezek. 16:53-58). "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and *the captivity of Samaria and her daughters*, THEN will I bring again the captivity of thy (Jerusalem's — verse 3) captives in the midst of them. * * * WHEN thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate, *and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate*, THEN thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate." There is no room here for that setting apart of the ten tribes "unto honour" which the Anglo-Israel theory contends for. Israel and Judah have sinned simultaneously: they are in punishment simultaneously; and they will return to Divine favour simultaneously — viz., to the land in which alone that favour to them is to be enjoyed. Thus the following prophecies will have their natural fulfilment:—

Jeremiah 3:18.—"In those days the *House of Judah* shall walk *with the House of Israel*, and they shall come TOGETHER out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers."

Isaiah 11:12.—"He shall assemble *the outcasts of Israel*, and gather together *the dispersed of Judah* from the four corners of the earth."

Jeremiah 50:4.—“In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, *the children of Israel* shall come, they and *the children of Judah* TOGETHER, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God.”

Jeremiah 30:3.—“For, lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of *my people Israel and Judah*, saith the Lord: and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it.”

Zechariah 10:6.—“I will strengthen *the House of Judah*, and I will save *the House of Joseph*, and I will bring them again to place them: for I have mercy upon them: and they shall be AS THOUGH I HAD NOT CAST THEM OFF.”

Ezekiel 39:25.—“Now (in the latter days, see chapter 38:16) will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon *the whole House of Israel*. * * * They shall know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there.”

Ezekiel 37:21, 22.—“I will take the children of Israel *from among the heathen*, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into *their own land*: and I will make them ONE NATION in the land upon the *mountains of Israel*; and one king shall be king to them all: * * * Neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all.”

The division into two political “houses” was a mere episode in the national history, brought about in punishment of the sins of Solomon. Anglo-Israelism artificially exalts it into a revolution with profound significance. Without reason it claims the conditional oath of favour to twelve-tribed Israel (Deut. 7:12), as the special inheritance of the separated ten tribes — ignoring the fact that the condition of favour has been breached in the constant disobedience of the whole nation, and shutting its eyes to the obvious conclusion, that if its construction of “the oath” were right, the oath ought to have averted the Assyrian captivity, and the many and sore evils into which the ten tribes were brought both before and after that event.

THE BLINDNESS OF ISRAEL.

There is an incessant allusion in Anglo-Israel literature to the exiled ten tribes as “the blind people”, by which is meant alleged blindness as to their own identity — ignorance as to who they are; and passages are quoted to show that this blindness, as the supporters of the theory contend, was foretold. Nothing could be more absurd than this part of their argument. Such an argument was of course necessary if the theory was to stand at all, because how otherwise could it account for the fact that the English have no history or tradition that could connect them with the ten tribes of Israel? There are passages that use the terms “blind” and

“blindness”; but when we ask for the meaning of the terms, the Anglo-Israel explanation at once disappears. The meaning is explained in too many ways in the Scriptures themselves to admit of any mistake. Paul said that “blindness in part is *happened* unto Israel” (Rom. 11:25). He could not mean they had forgotten who they were, for Mr. Hine himself admits that the ten tribes at that time, “beyond the Euphrates”, had full knowledge of their identity. (Of course! who ever forgot their identity!) It was not literal blindness of eye that was meant, Anglo-Israelites again being witness. The question is: What sort of blindness? The answer is plain: and the following passages contain it:—

2 Cor. 3:13.—“The children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: but THEIR MINDS WERE BLINDED: for until this day remaineth *the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament*, which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, *the veil is upon their heart.*”

John 9:39.—“For judgment I am come into this world; that they which *see not* might see, and that they which *see might be made blind.*”

John 12:39.—“Therefore they *could not believe*, because that Esaias said again, *He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart: that they should NOT SEE WITH THEIR EYES.*”

Ezekiel 12:2.—“Son of man, thou dwellest in the midst of a rebellious house, *which have eyes to see and see not.*”

Jeremiah 5:21.—“Hear now this, O foolish people, * * * *which have eyes and see not.*”

Acts 28:25.—“Well spake the Holy Spirit by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, * * * *seeing ye shall see, and not perceive.*”

The blindness in the case was mental obtuseness in relation to spiritual things. The reason of such an infliction is plainly set forth in Isaiah 29:13, 14, as follows: “Forasmuch as this people draw near Me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour Me, but *have removed their heart far from Me*, and their fear towards Me is taught by the precept of men: therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder; for *the wisdom of their wise men shall perish*, and the understanding of the prudent shall be hid.”

A similar result — the judicial infliction of blindness for the misuse of divinely-offered opportunities of enlightenment — has been manifest in the history of the Gentile Christendom, in accordance with Paul’s prediction: “*Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. For this cause, God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they might all be condemned who believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness*” (2 Thess. 2:10-12).

The infliction of moral blindness for such a reason is intelligible, but who can think of Mr. Hine's version of the matter (*the alleged loss of a people's recollection of who they are*) without amazement: first at the man's effrontery, who contends without evidence or reason that this is the meaning of the inflicted blindness; and second, at the gullibility of the people which should make serious confutation of his view a necessity. Mr. Hine's volubility on the blessings that are to result from Britain's recognition of her (so-called) identity is something phenomenal. One is to be pardoned for thinking of the lunatic asylum as he listens. According to his own showing, Israel was well aware of their identity 1,800 years ago and had been for centuries prior to that. Was the result of their self-knowledge (assuming they ever lost it) so very beneficent to themselves or others as to make its restoration an object of desire?

ISRAEL SAVED AND REDEEMED.

It is another constantly iterated assertion of the Anglo-Israelites, that Israel (said to be "lost") should, when "identified", be found "a Christian nation". When proof is asked for this, the interrogator is referred to Isaiah 45:17; "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." If he ask, in what way this proves the proposition which it is adduced to support, there is no reasonable response. The statement that Israel is to be saved (granting for the sake of argument that it meant what Mr. Hine means by being a Christian nation), points to an indefinite futurity. It fixes no time. It certainly has no application to the time when Israel is not saved but "lost". It is a repetition of the pledge of final blessedness with which the words of the prophets abound with reference to the house of Israel: and as this blessedness is always found associated with national restoration to Palestine, and Christ's presence as a governor in their midst, it can have no application to the time of their dispersion and darkness and Christ's absence. A single passage will settle this point: "I will take you (House of Israel — see verse 22) from among the heathen, and *gather you out of all countries and will bring you into your own land*. THEN will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness", etc. (Ezekiel 26:24).

Then we are referred to passages which state that Israel is to be "redeemed"; such as "O Israel, fear not, for I have *redeemed* thee: I have called thee by My name, thou art Mine" (Isaiah 43:1). "Return unto Me, for I have *redeemed* thee" (Isaiah 44:22). "The Lord hath *redeemed* His servant Jacob" (48:20). Stress is laid on the word "redeemed" as proving the point. A redeemed nation and a Christian nation are held to be synonymous. This might do very well for a book written in the style of Sunday School Hymns: as applied to the Bible, it is altogether inappropriate and mistaken. The Bible uses the word redeem in its simple sense, and not in the technical sense of clerical theology. It is applied to Israel under

Moses repeatedly. The Egyptian deliverance is promised in this form: "I will *redeem* you with a stretched-out arm" (Exod. 6:6). The deliverance was celebrated in this language: "Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people which Thou hast *redeemed*" (Exod. 15:13). "The Lord hath *redeemed* you out of the house of bond-men, from the king of Egypt" (Deuteronomy 7:8). There are numerous other instances. According to Mr. Hine's contention, these passages would prove that Israel was "a Christian nation" when they came out of Egypt. He says, "redeem" in the prophecies means "redeemed from Moses". If he is right, the passages quoted would show that they were redeemed from Moses in the act of being put under Moses. His theory is altogether artificial and false. It is based on his own dogmatism: and when people are willing to receive the undemonstrated assertions of an uninspired man as truth, they deserve to be deceived, as thousands are by Mr. Hine. "Redeem" in the prophecies is used in the sense of "deliver", without reference to the particular mode of deliverance adopted in given cases. Deliverance by Moses was redemption in one case; deliverance by Christ will be redemption in the other; but what has this to do with defining the state of Israel while they are in the dispersed and depraved position from which they are to be delivered?

THE TRIBE OF BENJAMIN.

Of all the gratuitous and ingenious shifts to which the exigencies of the Anglo-Israel theory drive its supporters, none is more extraordinary or inconsistent with facts than that which makes Benjamin one of the ten tribes left in the House of Judah as "gospel-bearers".

Benjamin was not one of the ten tribes. This is proved in a variety of ways. To Jeroboam, the first king of the separated tribes, ten tribes were promised: e.g. "Take thee (Jeroboam) *ten pieces* (of the rent garment), for thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and WILL GIVE TEN TRIBES TO THEE." No one believing the Scriptures will say that this promise was not fulfilled; consequently, in the absence of further information, we should be bound to assume that Jeroboam received ten tribes. But there is not an absence of information. The ten tribes given to Jeroboam are all casually mentioned in the course of Israel's history. The enumeration of the references will be found in the course of the Debate. *Benjamin is not among them.* But, more conclusive still, if that be possible, is the statement that Rehoboam, son of Solomon, after the revolt of Jeroboam, "had Judah AND BENJAMIN *on his side*" (2 Chron. 11:12).

Then, on the question of so-called light-bearing, the evidence is entirely against Mr. Hine's hypothesis. The tribe of Benjamin did not distinguish themselves in the kingdom of Judah for the maintenance of Divine light. On the contrary, they are declared at a certain stage to have been without a righteous man among them.

Thus: "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem (one of the cities of Benjamin — Josh. 18:21, 28) and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, *if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment that seeketh the truth*, and I will pardon it; * * * thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return. * * * Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord; shall not My soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" (Jer. 5:1, 3, 5). Mr. Hine, as was evident during the Debate, had overlooked the circumstance that Jerusalem was one of the cities of Benjamin, and that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were "children of Benjamin" (Jer. 6:1). Consequently, his Benjamite light-bearing theory suffers some embarrassment in presence of the prophet's declaration that "they are all grievous revolters, walking with slanders: they are brass and iron; they are all corrupters. Reprobate silver shall men call them, because the Lord hath rejected them" (Jer. 6:28, 30). He might attempt to evade the force of this by saying the so-called light-bearing was to be performed in the days of Christ, but there is no escape. He is confronted here by Christ's apostrophe to these same Benjamite inhabitants of Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children, as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate", etc. (Luke 13:34).

A LIGHT FOR THE HOUSE OF DAVID.

Mr. Hine has altogether blundered on this question of "light". He hangs his fancy on this subject on God's declaration by the prophet to Jeroboam, when intimating the coming disruption of the kingdom of David. "Unto his (David's) son will I give one tribe, *that David, My servant, may have A LIGHT always before Me in Jerusalem*" (1 Kings 11:36). To make this mean "gospel-bearing" is preposterous. It was David that was to have "a light" — not the people; and the political sense of this is settled by the frequent illustrations that occur throughout the Scriptures. Thus, when David had exposed himself to danger in battle, the people dissuaded him from further risks, "That thou quench not *the light* of Israel"; or, as in verse 17, "the lamp of Israel", that is, the political light of the nation. Thus, concerning the reign of Abijam, one of David's successors, who was permitted to reign, though unworthy, we read in 1 Kings 15:4, "Nevertheless, for David's sake, did the Lord his God give him *a lamp in Jerusalem TO SET UP HIS SON AFTER HIM.*" Of the same matter, in another relation, we read in Psa. 132:17, "There (in Zion) will I make the horn of David to bud: I have ordained a lamp for mine Anointed. His enemies will I clothe with shame; but *upon himself shall his crown flourish.*"

WHY ONE TRIBE.

There remains the question why the giving of one tribe to the House of Judah was necessary to preserve the light of the House of David. An obvious explanation is perceived when it is realised that Jerusalem, the seat of the kingdom, where the temple stood and the royal house reigned, was in the tribe of Benjamin, and if this had gone over to Jeroboam, Jeroboam would have taken his seat on the throne of David to the complete extinction of David's house. God's purpose to preserve the House of David required Jerusalem to be exempt from the effects of the revolt, and therefore that Benjamin, in which Jerusalem was situate, should remain with Judah. Standing in Jerusalem, the historian was standing in Benjamin, and could naturally say that none followed the royal city but the tribe of Judah only. From another point of view, contemplating Judah as the House of David, the prophet who foretold the disruption to Jeroboam, could with equal naturalness speak of one tribe being given to David. In this way the whole twelve tribes find appropriate, though not verbally visible, place in the prophet's discourse. Ten were given to Jeroboam; one (Benjamin) given to David (who stood for Judah, the remaining tribe): total, 12.

THE POSITION OF LEVI.

Levi was not reckoned among the twelve tribes in the national constitution. This was abundantly proved in the Debate. They stood legally obliterated under the circumstances detailed in the following passage: "*Thou shalt separate the Levites from among the Children of Israel: and the Levites shall be Mine. * * * For they are wholly given unto Me from among the Children of Israel; instead of such as open every womb, even instead of the first-born of all the Children of Israel have I taken them unto Me. For all the first-born of the Children of Israel are Mine, both men and beast, on the day that I smote every first-born in the land of Egypt I SANCTIFIED THEM FOR MYSELF*" (Num. 8:14-17). For further testimony on the point Num. 3:6, 9, 12, 13; 2:33; Exod. 13:2, 11-13; Num. 18:2, 20, may be referred to.

This Divine absorption, so to speak, of a whole tribe, left a blank in the national number of twelve tribes. This was filled up by dividing Joseph into two tribes — Ephraim and Manasseh, his two sons (Josh. 14:4). Thus was Joseph, the excellent and approved of God, specially honoured in the national constitution, and the tribes brought to the required number of twelve. Where, however, the race of Israel, without reference to its political constitution is represented, Levi is restored to his place and Ephraim and Manasseh merged in Joseph, as in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:28), of Moses (Deut. 33:1), the naming of the gates of Jerusalem in the future age (Ezek. 48:31), and, with a slight modification, in the symbolic sealing of the 144,000 "out of all the tribes of Israel" (Rev. 7:4).

When these matters are understood, the Anglo-Israel motion about Benjamin being one of the ten tribes, and Manasseh not having a place among the twelve, will disappear like mist before the sun, and with them the extraordinary exegetical artifices by which its supporters seek to divert the application of the term Israel to the nation of the Jews.

ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND THE SEED OF DAVID.

Mr. Hine finds it necessary to say the seed of David did not go to Babylon at the captivity (*Cui Bono*, page 17). The simple confutation of this statement is to be found on the very first page of the New Testament. Matthew, in his first verse, introduces Jesus Christ as "the son of David, the son of Abraham" (chap. 1:1). To prove that He is so, he subjoins the line of descent from Abraham to Christ. Where is that line at the time of the Babylonish captivity? The answer is found in verse 11: "Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, *about the time they were carried away to Babylon:* and AFTER THEY WERE BROUGHT TO BABYLON, Jechonias begat Salathiel, and Salathiel begat Zorobabel", etc. Therefore the seed of David *did* go to Babylon, Mr. Hine's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. Of course, he means the daughters of Zedekiah who were carried to Egypt, about whom he has a liking for some Irish legends which gave him a pretext for flattering Queen Victoria as an alleged descendant of David. But even if the legends were true, it would not help him, for blood descent is counted by the male line, and even if a female were an admissible link, Zedekiah's daughter would be of no use to him, because the "legitimate succession", on which Mr. Hine lays stress, lay with Jechoniah, who went to Babylon with Nebuchadnezzar, and not with Jechoniah's uncle, who was placed on the throne by Nebuchadnezzar to serve Nebuchadnezzar's ends. This is proved by the ignoring of Zedekiah in Matthew's genealogy, and also by the ordinary laws of descent, for while David's line is transmitted on the male side through Jechoniah, it came to an end in Zedekiah's family by the slaughter of all his sons and his own death afterwards (Jer. 52:10, 11). Jer. 22:30, directed against Jechoniah, did not exclude him from the ancestry of Christ. It merely decreed his own and his family's perpetual exclusion from the throne under the established system of things. The decree was carried out, for, though David's seed was preserved in his line, none of his family ever again occupied the throne which he had occupied for a brief space of time, and from which he was deposed by Nebuchadnezzar.

Mr. Hine's assertion that the seed of David was not in Palestine in the days of Christ is overthrown by the foregoing evidence. Christ is the converging and finishing point of David's line. Of Christ Himself, it is many times testified that he is "of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1:3; 2 Timothy 2:8; Acts 13:23; 2:29; Luke 1:32; Matthew 21:15; Revelation 22:16). No better illustration can be given of the pernicious tendency of this Anglo-Israelism than the fact that it

invalidates the position of the Lord Jesus, as the promised seed of David, to occupy his throne as defined in these passages. The House of David was preserved in existence till Christ was born. Thus has been fulfilled the Divine purpose that David should “always have a man to sit on his throne”. His throne is for a time in the dust but a son lives who shortly comes to raise it from the dust and “build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen” (Amos 9:11).

And what can we say to Mr. Hine’s assertion that the 2nd Psalm does not refer to Christ. (*Cui Bono*, page 16.) It is not easy to treat such a statement with patience in view of the fact that apostolic authority has declared it does (Acts 13:33; 4:24, 28). It is difficult to acquit Mr. Hine of the charge of either gross ignorance of the Scriptures or wilful perversion of facts.

THE IDOLATROUS BRITONS AND THE BRITISH TONGUE.

His treatment of other points is similar. Why do the English not circumcise? Why are they not divided into ten tribes? Oh, says Mr. Hine, because Paul who taught them Christianity taught them to abandon circumcision and tribeship when their ancestors were located in Asia Minor (*Identifications*, pages 6 and 9). Then, if Paul taught them Christianity so completely as to cause them to abandon circumcision and tribeship, how came they to be in such a benighted condition when they arrived in Britain, as Danes and Saxons, as Mr. Hine has it, worshipping Wodin, and practising idolatrous rites, having no knowledge of Paul or God or Israel, and requiring to be “converted to Christianity”? To this there is an incoherent answer to the effect that “God Almighty required them to arrive here in an idolatrous state”. There is not a particle of evidence in support of the answer. We could not discuss the question gravely were it not for the fact of people believing such outrageous nonsense.

Why do we not speak Hebrew? Oh, because God said to Israel, “With stammering lips and another tongue, will I speak to this people” (Isaiah 28:11). You mean English? Yes. When has God spoken to anybody in English — British, or anybody else? Oh, by the clergy! missionary operations. But clergymen and missionaries are not inspired. They merely retail what they have learnt, whether true or false. That is not God speaking. But we do not require to discuss the question. Paul has settled it and he is a rather better authority than Mr. Hine. Paul quotes the prophecy and applies it (1 Corinthians 14:21) to the miraculous speaking with foreign languages, which was one of the features of the apostolic ministry directed towards Israel (Acts 2:1-12; 1 Cor. 14:22). English had no existence when the prophecy which Mr. Hine prostitutes was fulfilled.

MR. HINE ANSWERS HIMSELF.

Inconsistently enough, while professing to account for the supposed total obliteration of the Hebrew tongue among the English by a predicted miracle, he tries to found an argument for our Israelitish identity on alleged Hebrew features in our names and dictionaries, and talks of Hebrew roots and Hebrew peculiarities, Hebrew features in our institutions — such as the Sabbath, the Ritualistic fondness for the Eastward Position, Hebrew phraseology in our Prayer Book, etc. Anything Hebrew he may discover in any of these items he unwittingly accounts for, in trying to fence off an argument for identification with the Samaritans who exhibited Hebrew peculiarities in their ways. He says (*Oxford Wrong*, page 174): “Thus, these Gentile people, now inhabiting the cities that Israel once dwelt in, the cities of Manasseh, and Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali, were brought up in the Mosaic service of Israel; taught to speak of Abraham as ‘our father Abraham’, the homely phrases of Israel becoming their household words: just exactly as in the same manner and sense, one of their very descendants in our Lord’s time, a purely Gentile woman, the ‘woman of Samaria’ asked him, ‘Art thou greater than our father Jacob’, etc. An argument good for the Samaritans is good for the British. Considering that, by means of the Bible, the British have been “brought up” in the admiration of Hebrew names and ways and principles; what marvel if Hebrew traces are discoverable in our family pedigrees and our ecclesiastical phraseology and institutions? Mr. Hine answers himself, if answer were needed.

THE NON-JEWISH PHYSIOGNOMY OF THE BRITISH.

Why do we not show the Hebrew physiognomy? Here there was a roar of ironical triumph from Mr. Hine’s sympathisers. They thought the interrogator had put his foot in a quagmire. They seemed to say: “Is that all you know? Are you not aware that the Jewish physiognomy is not the standard of Israelitish physiognomy? Do you not know that the Jews had their faces changed because they crucified Christ?” On what is this astounding suggestion founded? On one passage, and one passage only, which Mr. Hine introduces in this way (*Oxford Wrong*, page 159): “Prior to the crucifixion they (the Jews) could have passed anywhere without even being known, except by their Mosaic observances. After the crucifixion their recognition was to be universal, and how was this to be effected? Only by the mark of God being fixed upon them: their physical type was now to be re-cast — to undergo an entire change. * * * Scripture is *so explicit* upon this point, for speaking alone to Judah, and not to Israel, in a passage where Judah is directly mentioned by name, without any reference to Israel at all, we are told: ‘Judah is fallen: because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord to provoke the eyes of His glory, the show of their countenance shall witness against them’ (Isaiah 3:8-9). Thus from this time they became a marked people, that they

might be recognised anywhere, and this was to be done by the show of their countenance being the tell-tale, witnessing against themselves, which was a new sign, a new mark that they had not previously borne." The first thing to be remarked upon this extraordinary piece of exegetical dogmatism is that the passage is incorrectly and incompletely quoted, with the effect of declaring a different thing from what the passage declares as it stands in the Bible. Whether this was an effect intended by Mr. Hine or not, we leave others to decide. The passage as quoted is made to threaten a certain "show of countenance" as a future visitation in punishment of sin. The passage as it stands in the Bible does no such thing: as will be seen by its full quotation as follows:—

"Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen; *because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of His glory.* The show of their countenance doth (not "shall") witness against them: and they declare their sin as Sodom, *they hide it not.*"

Mr. Hine, in his quotation of this, mutilates and alters the construction of the opening sentence, and in the second sentence he alters a word. This is a fact self-evident to the reader. On the meaning of the fact we need not comment: the result is to enable him to get an apparent sanction to his preposterous answer to the very palpable objection to his theory, that the British show no trace of Hebrew extraction in their physiognomy, which the Jews do. An apparent sanction only. The meaning of the passage is plain on the face of it. The "show of their countenance" is not introduced as a threatened punishment, but as an actual manifest token of their guilt. The prophet's own periphrasis — which Mr. Hine suppresses — proves it: "They declare their sin as Sodom: **THEY HIDE IT NOT.**" This is the idea of the verse — that transgression, as the cause of the national ruin, was palpable in the very face of the people. A verse or two further on informs us that "the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with *stretched forth necks and WANTON EYES.*" On the same subject, Jeremiah 3:3 declares: "Thou hadst a whore's forehead, *thou refusedst to be ashamed.*"

If the people who roared out their defiant response to the question about Jewish physiognomy had known the facts of the case, they would not have involved themselves in the disgrace of this "wresting of the Scriptures", this "handling of the Word deceitfully", of which both Peter and Paul make mention.

"A COMPANY OF NATIONS"

Mr. Hine complained that no notice had been taken of his argument on God's promise to Jacob, that "a nation, and a company of nations, would be of him" (Gen. 35:11). No notice was taken of this, — first, because of the abundance of other matter to be dealt with; and, secondly, because the argument had been answered in the Memorial Hall Lecture published prior to the discussion. There is

really nothing of an Anglo-Israel value in the argument. Before it could be of any value in this direction, it would have to be shown that its fulfilment was to transpire during the time of Israel's exile from their land. This cannot be done. The reverse can be shown, and has been shown in the course of the Debate. Even the context of the promise shows it, for there immediately follow these words: "And *the land* which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land", showing that possession of the land is collateral with the promise of development into "a nation and a company of nations". There is nothing in the promise, in a chronological sense, to fix the time of the promise. We must therefore be guided by the facts of the case elsewhere obtainable. These present themselves in two phases. First, there is the accomplished performance of the promise, when Israel were in their land; and, second, there is the more glorious performance in "the time of restitution spoken of by the prophets", when Jesus will no longer remain away from the earth, but return to occupy the throne of David, and rule all nations in subjection to that throne. As regards the first accomplishment, Israel (that is, Jacob — for Israel was Jacob's added name) grew into "a nation, and a company of nations", that is, a nation which was a company of nations, a nation divinely organised in twelve sub-nationalities or tribes, having each a princely head, in subjection to the authority of God emanating from the oracular mercy seat in the Mosaic tabernacle.

The idea is better expressed by the translation adopted by some Hebraists — "a nation, *even* a company of nations." This translates the Hebrew particle *wav* in an expletive instead of a conjunctive sense. That this rendering is admissible is shown by its adoption in other instances in the common version, such as 1 Sam. 28:3; "All Israel buried Samuel in Ramah, *even (wav)* in his own city"; and Mal. 3:1; "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, *even (wav)* the messenger of the covenant." Doubtless the particle is most commonly used in a conjunctive sense, but these illustrations show that an expletive sense must be allowed where the sense requires it. Otherwise we should make Israel bury Samuel in two places at once, *i.e.*, "in Ramah *and* in his own city". In the case of "a nation *and* a company of nations", it is a question of what the facts are. We must not subordinate the facts to an assumed sense of a variable Hebrew particle: the facts must determine the sense. The facts are obvious. Jacob became a nation, *even* a company of nations.

Suppose, however, for the sake of argument, we were compelled to take it with the sense contended for by Anglo-Israelism: "a nation *and* a company of nations", that is, nations besides the nation, the Anglo-Israelite view, that it means England and her colonies, would not be proved. It would still have to be proved first that the present time is the time contemplated in the prophecy. This cannot be done, as has been already made apparent, for now is the time of dispersion and down-treading, as evidenced by the state of the land which is the basis of the whole matter. We should therefore have to seek in Israel's prophetic

futurity a state of things answering to the terms. And in this there would be no difficulty: for what do we find? That in that day "Many nations shall be joined unto the Lord" (Zech. 2:11); when "The Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: the strangers shall be *joined with them*, and they shall cleave to the House of Jacob" (Isaiah 14:1); that "Many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord" (Zech. 8:22). "All the nations shall be gathered * * * to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart" (Jer. 3:17).

Here is a prospect fully answering to the most ample construction that could be put upon "a nation and a company of nations." All the nations of the world united in one political family with the House of Israel, in subjection to the throne of David, would surely be quite as good a counterpart to the Anglo-Israelite view of the prophecy in question as the more limited and vastly less interesting picture of Britain and her colonies. If it be insisted on that the company of nations must be lineal descendants of Jacob, and not political subordinates, it has to be pointed out that the Anglo-Israelites make no difficulty on this point in their application of the prophecy to the British colonies. The large numbers of French in Canada, Germans and Irish in the United States (Manasseh, according to Mr. Hine!), the Dutch and Danes in other colonies, are made no difficulty in the way of claiming these countries, which have but a weak English element in the population, as the "company of nations". If it is no difficulty in the one case, it can be none in the other; for all nations under Christ will be ruled by Israelites, natural and adopted, His own immortal friends of all ages; and there will be a large element of Jewish population in honourable circulation among them in the altered circumstances that will then have come to Zion (Isaiah 61:9; Zeph. 3:19, 20).

THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL'S PUNISHMENT.

Among the many self-stultifications of the Hine theory, the most glaring instance, perhaps, is furnished by its selection of A.D.1840 as the terminal point of Israel's "seven times" of punishment for their sin. (See *Oxford Wrong*, page 151.) If Israel's punishment lasted till then, how can England be Israel, seeing that the punishment, as defined in the very Scripture from which the "seven times" measurement is taken (Lev. 21:21) was to consist of dispersion among the heathen (verse 33), weakness and faintness of condition (36), with no power to stand before their enemies (37)? To meet this, we have an extraordinary declaration, completely nullifying the idea of Israel's punishment lasting till A.D.1840, or any other time, that Israel in Britain (!) is not liable to punishment (*Cui Bono*, page 9); that no amount of national abomination can cancel the oath of blessing! Here the badness of Anglo-Israelism appears. If no amount of abomination can alienate Britain from Divine favour, what effect is the idea likely to produce on the English

people? The idea is as monstrous as it is untrue, even supposing the utterly unsupported identity of the English with Israel. If the idea were correct, the expatriation of the ten tribes ought never to have taken place. Punishment ought never to have taken place at any time. The "oath" of Mr. Hine's argument ought to have averted all calamities for their sins. God has not changed. He cannot change. His principles of action towards His responsible creatures are always the same. The very oath of favour was conditional on obedience (Deut. 4:29-31). Jehovah's own declaration to Jeremiah is destructive of Mr. Hine's "no-amount-of-abomination" gloss, viz., "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build, and to plant it; *if it do evil in My sight, that it obey not My voice, I WILL REPENT OF THE GOOD WHEREWITH I SAID I WOULD BENEFIT THEM*" (Jer. 18:9). The true relation of Israel to the blessings that might have been theirs are pathetically set forth in the following quotations, which of themselves completely overthrow Mr. Hine's demoralising "no-amount-of-abomination" theory: "Oh that thou hadst hearkened to My commandments! THEN had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea: thy seed also *had been* as the sand, and the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof" (Isaiah 48:18). "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight" (Deut. 32:29, 30). "Oh that My people had hearkened unto Me, and Israel had walked in My ways! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned My hand against their adversaries" (Psa. 81:13, 14).

"THE ISLES".

Mr. Hine's argument on this subject will be found answered in the Lecture on the "True Position of Britain". There is just one feature of the case not developed in that Lecture. If Israel is found "a Christian nation in the isles" when Christ comes, how are we to understand statements which show that the inhabitants of the isles are at that time to receive severe treatment that they may be brought to the knowledge of God; .e.g., "I will send a fire on Magog, and on THEM THAT DWELL CARELESSLY IN THE ISLES; and they shall know that I am the Lord" (Ezek. 39:6). The context shows this to apply to the latter days and the appearing of Christ. Again, "I will send those that escape of them to the nations * * * to the isles afar off, that have not heard My fame, neither have seen My glory" (Isaiah 66:19). Verse 15 of the chapter shows it to refer to the appearing of Christ. The isles in the case include Britain unquestionably; but they are isles inhabited not by a Divine and obedient Israel, but by a proud and careless race who require to be enlightened on the first principles of the Oracles of God.

ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND ROMANS 11.

No amount or intensity of animadversion would be too severe for Mr. Hine's treatment of the eleventh chapter of Romans and its context. He borrows the name of his magazine from Rom. 11:15. The verse reads: "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but *life from the dead*?" The last four words constitute the name in question. He claims the verse for the ten tribes, and dilates wondrously on the strength of it, on the effects that are to flow from his so-called identification, which he understands Paul to mean by "the receiving of them." With his foolish interpretation of a statement of Paul's, no fault might particularly be found; but what are we to say to his deliberate evasion of the results involved in his own interpretation? If the "them" of verse 15, are the ten tribes, so are the "them" of verse 11 — for Paul has introduced no new "them" between. We ask Mr. Hine, therefore, how the fall of the ten tribes in Paul's time brought salvation to the Gentiles, when, according to him, the ten tribes did not fall, but received the gospel and began their career of blessing? and what Paul means by saying in verse 7 that the same "Israel had not obtained what he sought for", and in chap. 9:31, that the same Israel had not attained to righteousness but had stumbled at Christ? To this Mr. Hine replies that in these cases Paul means the Jews. Why? Mr. Hine has no reason to give — merely his *ipse dixit*, and that against manifest reason in the case, as any reader may satisfy himself by reading the chapter. No doubt Paul means the Jews, but in that case he means the Jews in verse 15 as well, where he is speaking of the same people, and where Mr. Hine claims, not only without evidence — but against the evidence, he is speaking of the ten tribes. Such a treatment of Scripture reminds us of the statement Mr. Hine made in the course of the Debate about Josephus, that he believed in him only in so far as he suited his purpose! It is a kind of interpretation that is unworthy of serious refutation. We would not condescend to notice it, were it not for the numbers who are being misled by him to their hurt.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In fulfilment of the promise made at the close of the Debate, a few pages are added for the consideration of objections and difficulties brought forward by individual correspondents. Most of them will be found already dealt with in the Appendix. Where this is the case, it will not be necessary to do more than refer to the answer already written.

First comes the letter of Mr. H.S. Icke, as follows:—

DEAR SIR,—At the close of the Debate, in Exeter Hall, you kindly promised to answer questions on the Anglo-Israel controversy in an appendix to the report of the discussion about to be published. For the sake of distinction I refer to the ten-tribed kingdom as “Ephraim-Israel”, and the two-tribed kingdom as “Judah-Israel”. A reply to the following queries would much oblige.

Yours truly, H.S. ICKE.

[Then follow the queries, which, for the sake of clearness, we shall set forth one by one with the answers,]

1.—*Do you think the promises given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of their seed becoming “a great nation”, “as the dust of the earth”, as “a nation and a company of nations”, as “possessing the gate of his enemies”, have been fulfilled in the past history of the Hebrew race in the Land of Palestine, which was only about the size of Wales?*

ANSWER:—There was doubtless a fulfilment of these promises in the history of Israel, under Moses, and the succeeding judges and kings. Thus, Moses said to them, on the eve of their entering into the land, under Joshua: “The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude” (Deuteronomy 1:10). “Thy fathers went down into Egypt with three-score and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God *hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude*” (Deuteronomy 10:22). “What nation is there *so great*, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day”? (Deuteronomy 4:8). The conclusion is further evident from the precise statement made concerning the subjugation of the land by Joshua, and its division for inheritance among the tribes: “The Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. *There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the House of Israel*” (Joshua 21:43).

But there is a coming fulfilment on a larger scale, as we learn from the prophets

and apostles. This coming fulfilment will result in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. See remarks in Appendix on "The Company of Nations", page 138.

2.—*Do you not think that the present position England occupies in the world, as Great Britain, with her numerous colonies, literally "a company of nations", possessing "the gates of her enemies" (defensive positions constantly spoken of in the secular press as "gates", "gateways", "keys") in all parts of the world, as already to be numbered by tens of millions, and increasing in a greater ratio than any other race — would be a grander exemplification of the fulfilment of these God-given promises, than any that have yet been realised in the past history of the recognised Hebrew race?*

ANSWER:—It cannot be that the position of England is the position assigned to Israel in the futurity of unfulfilled prophecy; for this simple reason, that both Israel and the nations associated with her in that unfulfilled prophecy are exhibited as subject to the direct authority of God, ministered by a Son of David reigning in Jerusalem (Jer. 3:17; 23:5; Isaiah 24:23; Isaiah 9:6, 7; Micah 4:1-8); with the result of all nations abandoning war and living together in a condition of enlightenment and love, and a resultant state of blessedness and peace (Isaiah 2:1-4; 11:1-8; 25:6-9; 32:1; and many other places).

England is a purely human government and the state of things among her populations makes the hearts of good men groan. As for the "gates", while the secular press may speak of defensive positions in this way, we are not to conclude that these are what the Bible means when it speaks of gates. We must not govern the Bible by modern idioms, but subject our modern speech and notions to Bible usage. The "priest" of the Bible is not the cowled creature of modern ecclesiasticism. The "gates" of Scripture are not what men may choose to call gates now. It is a metaphor derived from the fact that the gate in ancient cities was the place of authority and power. To possess the gate of your enemies was to possess, not a defensive position in their territories, but to possess the territories themselves. Any reasonable man may satisfy himself of the truth of these statements by a comparison of the following passages: Deut. 16:18; Obadiah 13; Isaiah 14:31; 24:12; Psa. 69:12; 107:16; 118:20; Micah 1:9; Prov. 14:19; 24:7; 31:23; Jer. 39:3; Dan. 2:49. For the seed of Israel to possess the gate of their enemies, is for Israel to have dominion over all nations under Christ, as expressed in Isaiah 60:12. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (This is after Christ has come: see preceding chapter, verse 20, and same chapter — 60, verse 1). Or as it is expressed in Micah 5:8; "The remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep * * * *Thine hand shall be lifted up upon thine adversaries, and all thine enemies shall be cut off*". (This is when Christ reigns: see verse 2, applied in the New Testament to Christ, Matt. 2:5.) For further remarks, in answer to this question, see Preface.

3.—*Have the blessings pronounced upon Joseph, Ephraim, and Manasseh, by Jacob and Moses, been fulfilled? If so, when and how?*

ANSWER:—They have partly been fulfilled in the accomplished history of Israel, but will receive a more striking and complete fulfilment when the kingdom is restored to Israel under Christ and the apostles (Luke 22:28, 29). Joseph (who is represented by his sons Ephraim and Manasseh) held prominent and honourable place in the national constitution and history under the first covenant, and will do the same under the second. The proof is contained in the matter furnished in the answer to questions 1 and 2, and in sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Appendix, and in several parts of the Debate.

4.—*Was the separation of Ephraim-Israel from Judah-Israel a Divine arrangement?*

ANSWER:—Yes, as a punishment for Solomon's sins (1 Kings 11:31-33).

5.—*From the time of the disruption, have the two houses had a separate history, and are they still dis-united?*

ANSWER:—They have had a separate history since the time of the disruption, and they are still dis-united, except in so far as small parts are interfused in the dispersion, after the illustration of 2 Chron. 11:16; Luke 2:36; Acts 1; Acts 2:5, 9-11. In the bulk they are still dis-united.

6.—*Does the term Ephraim in Isaiah 7:8, and many other places that might be mentioned, refer to the tribe singly or to the ten-tribed kingdom, of which Ephraim was the head?*

ANSWER:—It refers to the ten-tribed kingdom.

7.—*Can you explain why the promises of temporal power, prosperity, and greatness, are so much spoken of in connection with Ephraim, when, in this advanced period of the world's history, the only recognised seed of Israel are the Jews — "few in number" — scattered throughout the world without a country and a house of their own?*

ANSWER:—Here it would have been well to have tried to give illustrations. It is not the fact that the promises of temporal power, etc., are spoken of in connection with Ephraim to the exclusion of Judah. They are both always associated in these promises. For proof, we refer to section 1 in the Appendix, "Judah and Israel", and to the Debate generally.

8.—*Because the judgments denounced by Moses were addressed to the twelve tribes united, does it necessarily follow that both houses must now be under the curses in their divided state?*

ANSWER:—Unquestionably; because their division (itself a punishment as already proved) did not alter the relation of either part to the national constitution in which they stood under Moses.

9.—*Was Ephraim-Israel involved in the guilt of crucifying the Lord, and in the curse invoked, "His blood be on us and on our children?"*

ANSWER:—No: but that was only one item in a long course of disobedience, spread over centuries. The judgment that came was not in punishment of the Lord's rejection as a single act, but in retribution for the iniquity of which that was the last filling drop of the cup. So Christ says: "Fill ye up then *the measure of your fathers*, * * * that upon you may come *all the righteous blood shed upon the earth*. * * * ALL THESE THINGS shall come upon this generation" (Matthew 23:32, 35, 36). See also the parable recorded Matthew 21:33-41. Ephraim's cup was full much earlier than Judah's; for the history of the ten tribes was an unmixed history of idolatry and wickedness: therefore their punishment came seven centuries sooner; and they remain in dispersion till He come whose duty it is to "raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel" (Isaiah 49:6).

10.—*You admit that the Jews to this hour reject the Messiah: but can you prove that the Gospel never reached Ephraim-Israel, over whom Jehovah yearned with such pathetic tenderness, and that they never accepted?*

ANSWER:—The Gospel was certainly preached by the apostles to all Israel, who were in their days commonly known as Jews throughout the world. The proof is contained in the Discussion and Appendix. It exists furthermore in such a statement as that of Paul, that the Gospel "was (in his day) preached to *every creature which is under heaven*" (Col. 1:23); also in the information that Israel was present at Pentecost from the countries where the ten tribes were. (See Acts 2:5, 9, 22.) Speaking expressly of Israel (Rom. 10) Paul says, "Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world" (verse 18). There is not only this evidence that the Gospel was preached to Israel, but there is evidence that they rejected it. The book of Acts is full of it, and much could be quoted. Let Paul's simple statement suffice: "As concerning the Gospel, they are enemies for your sakes" (Rom. 11:28). "Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; *because of unbelief*, THEY WERE BROKEN OFF, and thou standest by faith" (verses 19, 20). "Through *their fall* salvation is come unto the Gentiles" (verse 11). Mr. Hine claims that the ten tribes are spoken of in verse 15. Consequently, these statements made concerning those who are spoken of in verse 15, proves that the Gospel was preached to the ten tribes and rejected by them.

11.—*If they accepted it, can you tell me why they should not come under blessings?*

ANSWER:—Answered in reply to the last. But even if they had accepted, blessings would not have followed. Acceptance of the Gospel does not ensure present blessedness, except in a prospective sense: "He lifted up His eyes on *His disciples*, and said * * * Blessed are ye that *hunger now*: for ye shall be filled" (Luke 6:20, 21). "We must *through much tribulation* enter into the Kingdom of

God" (Acts 14:22; 1 Pet. 1:6, 7; 4:13, and many other places). The blessedness offered in the Gospel is not national and present, but individual and future.

12.—*Was Jesus sent to "the lost sheep of the House of Israel"? Is He exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins? Was He "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that are under the law?"*

ANSWER:—Yes.

13.—*If so, can you explain how it is that our Saviour's special mission for nearly 2,000 years has been an utter failure (I speak reverently) inasmuch as the only recognised seed of Israel — the Jews — reject Him to this day?*

ANSWER:—That it was to be for a time an apparent "utter failure" is prophetically recognised. In a beautiful prophecy concerning "Him whom may despiseth, Him whom the nation abhorreth" (Isaiah 49:7); who of course is no other than the Man of Sorrows, having the name Israel as well as other names; He is represented as saying, "I have laboured in vain: I have spent My strength for nought and in vain" (verse 4). It is recorded in the New Testament that "He came to His own and His own received Him not" (John 1:11). In His own parable of the vineyard, He represents the keepers of it saying among themselves as He approached, "This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and seize on *his inheritance*. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him" (Matt. 21:38). The cause of the failure is defined by Paul (Acts 28:27), in quoting from Isaiah, "The heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed." The providential object accomplished in Israel's rejection of the offered mercy is described by him in the words he immediately adds: "Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto THE GENTILES, and that *they will hear it*." The matter is further clearly presented in what he says to the Romans (11:11, 15): "Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather, *through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles*. * * * *If the casting away of them be THE RECONCILING OF THE WORLD, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?*"

But the failure is only temporary. Christ returns anon. The heavens hold Him only "till the time of restitution" (Acts 3:19, 20); and then His whole work shall have its glorious issue in the bringing back of Jew and Gentile to God, to walk in ways of wisdom, righteousness, prosperity, and peace. "And so all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11:26); and the "Gentiles shall come from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit" (Jeremiah 16:19; 3:17).

14.—*Can you tell me what nation was referred to in Matthew 21:43; "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof?"*

ANSWER: Christ settles it in Luke 12:32: "Fear not, little flock (His disciples), for it is your Father's good pleasure to give YOU the kingdom." They are to reign

with Christ in the kingdom of Israel, and bring forth the fruit in glory to God and blessing to men (Matthew 19:27; Luke 22:28). Thus the kingdom taken from the Scribes and Pharisees will be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. The people of Christ are styled a nation — an holy nation (1 Peter 2:9) and “the righteous nation *which keepeth* THE TRUTH” (Isaiah 26:2). The brethren of Christ are to be “kings and priests unto God, and to reign with Him on the earth” (Revelation 1:6; 5:1). The basis of this reigning is the kingdom restored to Israel, which they are to possess and administer (Acts 1:6; Luke 1:32; 22:28; Daniel 7:15-27).

15.—*Can you tell me where is the place — the safe retreat — appointed by God for His people Israel, as mentioned by Nathan in 2 Samuel 7:10: “Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more”?*

ANSWER:—The answer is contained in Ezekiel: “I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to THEIR OWN LAND, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country; and I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the HIGH MOUNTAINS OF ISRAEL shall their fold be * * * They shall dwell safely, and none shall make them afraid (Ezekiel 34:13, 14, 28).

16.—*Has Judah-Israel, so far as you know, been located in their “place” up to A.D. 1879?*

ANSWER:—The work of locating them has begun.

17.—*Is England “set on high above all the nations of the earth”? is she the “chief of nations”? — “the head and not the tail”? — “above and not beneath”? Has she been blessed in her commerce, in her agriculture, in her fecundity? Have her enemies been smitten before her? Has any invasion been successful since the Norman Conquest? Were the Normans not “of the same primitive race as the Anglo-Saxons”? and since the fusion of these similar races, has not the English nation been consolidated? Do we “lend unto many nations and not borrow”? Do we “reign over many nations” and no nation reign over us? Are not the Anglo-Saxons and the Jews the only people who can in any way be said, in a national sense, to keep a “seventh day” — the former the “Christian sabbath”, as it is usually called; the latter, the Jewish? Has England been “in the midst of many nations as a lion, tearing in pieces, etc.” — a great conquering power? Has she been, and is she now, “in the midst of many nations as a dew from the Lord” — a power of blessing — “declaring God’s glory among the Gentiles” (nations)? Is England a great maritime power, her “seed being in many waters”? Is she not a great mining power, possessing in a marked degree “the chief things of the ancient mountains”, and “the precious things of the lasting hills”? Does England “give glory to God, and declare His praise in the islands? To a speaker in Palestine, having the Mediterranean Sea on the west, would not “the isles afar off” be a fit*

designation for the British Isles? Was drunkenness a sin of "Ephraim-Israel" denounced by the prophets of old? Is drunkenness our "national sin"?

ANSWER:—In reply to this series of questions we can only say, that whatever might be the position of England in the various aspects indicated, it could be no proof of her identity with the lost ten tribes in the absence of the vital marks of identity, and in the presence of the various Scriptural facts, and necessities, and prophecies indicated in the course of the Debate. Her position undoubtedly is a great one in preparation for the part she has to play in the transition from the present to the future age, a part exhibited in the Lecture to be found at the end of the report of the Debate, commencing on page 106: but it is not the position required for Israel by the prophecies referred to in the questions. England is not the head. The world has no head at present. Europe is an agglomeration of powers on a footing of equality. When a difficult international question has to be settled, the powers have to meet, and discuss, and submit to mutual compromises. None of them dare take the position of head. Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome have all been head in their day — masters of the world, without a rival. If political supremacy is to identify a power with the promised headship of Israel, there was far more reason for fixing the identity on these powers than on England, which has to accommodate herself diplomatically to the interests and exigencies of the co-ordinate powers of the world. As to the success of her commerce, trade, and agriculture, other nations in past times have had their turn.

Venice, Holland, Portugal, and even France, have one after the other been England's superior in ages past. British prosperity in these fields of human activity is a comparatively recent affair. It is very important in its place, but it does not prove British identity with Israel any more than a similar position in past times proved other nations to be Israel.

As for unsuccessful invasion, the history of England has been a history of revolution and blood from the beginning. The Romans held the country in subjection for four centuries. On their retirement the Picts and Scots overran the country, and brought the native Britons into great distress. The Britons sent for the Saxons to protect them. The Saxons came and proved worse to the Britons than the Picts and Scots. The Britons were brought into subjection to the Saxons, and grievously oppressed for a time. Arthur, a prince of the Britons, rose against the Saxons, defeated them in several battles, overthrew their power, drove them out of the principal parts of the country and secured forty years' tranquility. Other German bands arrived at different times, and renewed the war against the Britons. The war lasted with intervals, for 135 years. Finally, the Saxons prevailed, and the Britons who were not exterminated retired to Cornwall and the Welsh mountains, and many fled to France where they founded Brittany. When the Britons were subdued, jealousies and dissensions arose among the Saxon chiefs, resulting in perpetual war among themselves. Taking advantage of this, the Normans and Danes invaded Britain in the ninth century; they were at first defeated by the

Saxons under Egbert at Henges Down, but the Danes returned with fury, and though often repulsed and sometimes thoroughly defeated, they made a supreme effort. After a long struggle, lasting many disastrous years, the Danes, reinforced by new swarms from the Continent, got the upper hand and brought the Saxons into subjection. This subjection lasted a considerable time; finally, Prince Alfred broke the Danish yoke, and in one or two succeeding reigns there were cruel massacres of the Danes all through England. These brought retaliation from the Danes on the Continent. In A.D. 1003, Sweyn, king of Denmark, took vengeance on the English for the slaughter of his countrymen. England was overthrown, and Canute, the king of Denmark's son, became England's master. About 40 years afterwards, England shook off the Danish yoke, and the Saxon monarchy was becoming established, when a new enemy in the shape of a rabble of Papal adventurers, under the leadership of William, the Duke of Normandy, landed on the shores of England, and overthrew English power at Hastings, establishing the dynasty of William the Conqueror. This was far on in the eleventh century. Since then, though there has been no new inroad of Continental strangers, the history of English politics has been a history of continual intrigue and bloodshed and revolution. To call such a history, the history of a divinely-guided nation, etc. — Ephraim under blessedness, — is to divert language from its rational use and make it an instrument of delusion.

As to the Sabbath, that is borrowed from the state ecclesiasticism established by Constantine, which prevailed in Romanised England for centuries. As to England being a dew from the Lord, declaring God's glory among the Gentiles, the case appears in a different light when the truth is known. England requires bedewing herself. She herself is the victim of Bible-nullifying tradition, and the subject of the predicted darkness which should cover the earth before the rising of the great light of Israel — the coming of Christ, to lighten all the earth with His glory. Doubtless she is included in "the isles afar off", but with a very different result from that contemplated in the questions, as will be apparent from the Lecture on "The True Position of Britain", and the article on "The Isles". The question about drunkenness does not call for serious notice.

18.—*Is there nothing singular in the fact that our royal standard should be the lion and the unicorn — emblems of Israel and Ephraim or Joseph?*

ANSWER:—The lion was Judah's standard, not Ephraim's (Gen. 49:9). If, therefore, there is any Hebrew significance in British heraldry, it would establish our Jewish and not our Ephraimitish extraction — a conclusion very unacceptable to Anglo-Israelism. As to the unicorn, it was not used as the standard of any of the tribes. There were only four standards — symbolically incorporated in the cherubim as the symbol of the Divine encampment — the lion, the ox, the eagle, and the man, corresponding to the four camps into which the congregation of Israel was divided in their journey to the land of promise (see Num. 2). The unicorn was not one of the standards. The unicorn, or one-horned beast —

(perhaps the rhinoceros) — is introduced in the blessing of Moses as a metaphor merely, and not as a heraldic symbol: “His (Joseph’s) glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns *like the horns of unicorns*.” It is a figurative expression of strength. If a heraldic symbol is to be extracted from it, then we ought to have rain in the heraldry as well, because it is said of Israel’s king that he shall be “like rain upon the mown grass”. Mr. Hine, or somebody else, has blundered in this matter. It is one of many ingenious misapplications by which Anglo-Israelism is sought to be established.

19.—*Is there nothing singular in Ephraim being compared to “a bullock” and our sobriquet being John Bull?*

ANSWER:—If our standard had been a bull, it would at least have been a curious coincidence, because the standard of the camp of Ephraim was an ox; but our standard being the same as Judah’s, a *sobriquet* due probably to the beef-eating propensities of the English race, is surely not worth serious consideration.

20.—*The first-born usually claims the inheritance: is not the birthright said to be Joseph’s, and does not God call Ephraim his first-born?*

ANSWER:—The birthright was given to Joseph’s sons, because of the misbehaviour of Reuben, the real first-born (1 Chron. 5:1); but this did not confer more than precedence of rank and genealogy, as evident from the fact that all Israel — (the twelve tribes in Egypt) — are styled Jehovah’s “first-born” (Exod. 4:22, 23), and that all of them shared equally in the inheritance. Ephraim’s precedence as the first-born is shown in the leading part played by that tribe in all the history of Israel.

21.—*Can you point to any other nation under heaven possessing, in so marked a manner as England, Israel’s promised blessings, and doing Israel’s appointed work?*

ANSWER: No nation under heaven, at the present time, exhibits the one or exemplifies the other. Israel’s promised blessing and Israel’s appointed work cannot be realised in the absence of Israel’s appointed leader, the Son of David, the Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, under whom both will become the greatest realities of the age, in a way not to be mistaken. “The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.”

22.—*Has the prophecy concerning Ephraim, in Zechariah 10, been fulfilled in any measure in “far countries” and “among the people”, or is it altogether to be fulfilled in the future?*

ANSWER: The prophecy is a prophecy of the restoration of both the Houses of Israel, as manifest from verse 6: “I will strengthen THE HOUSE OF JUDAH, and I will save THE HOUSE OF JOSEPH, and I will *bring them again to place them*; for I have mercy on them: and *they shall be as though I had not cast them off*.” Even Anglo-Israelites will allow that this is future. In view of this evident futurity of the

whole, it is unsafe to depend upon a present application of any part of the prophecy, however plausible. There will, of course, be operations preliminary to the execution of the work of restoration, but nothing of the character to justify the theory that Ephraim is to be found at that time a great and prosperous nation in any part of the world.

These are all Mr. Icke's questions. he adds, "If you can answer these satisfactorily, in a non-Anglo-Israel sense, I shall be prepared to give up my Anglo-Israelism". His questions cover nearly the whole ground, and obviate the necessity of saying anything in answer to other correspondents.
